Calendar No.

99TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
99-670

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1987

JULY 15, 1986.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. BEVILL, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 5162]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes.

61-313

H183-8

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Bill	Page Report
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
General investigations	2	7
Construction, general	3	27
Flood control and coastal emergencies	5	34
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	5	34
Operation and maintenance, general	6	40
Revolving fund	7	54
General expenses	7	54
II. Department of the Interior:		
Bureau of Reclamation:		
General investigations	9	57
Construction program	10	61
Operation and maintenance	12	66
Loan program	13	67
Emergency fund	15	69
Working Capital Fund	15	69
General administrative expenses	14	69
III. Department of Energy:		
Energy supply, research and development	19	72
Uranium supply and enrichment	20	99
General science and research	21	103
Nuclear waste disposal fund	22	107
Atomic energy defense activities	22	107
Departmental administration	23	125
Power marketing administrations:		
Alaska Power Administration	24	131
Bonneville Power Administration	24	131
Southeastern Power Administration	24	132
Southwestern Power Administration	25	133
Western Area Power Administration	25	134
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	26	135
Geothermal resources development fund	26	135
IV. Independent agencies:		
Appalachian Regional Commission	28	137
Delaware River Basin Commission	29	139
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	30	139
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	30	140
Susquehanna River Basin Commission	31	141
Tennessee Valley Authority	31	141
House Reporting Requirements	.....	147

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in *The Budget of the United States Government, 1987—Appendix, and the budget amendment contained in House Doc. 99-184.* The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 1986, the budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1987:

	1986 appropriations adjusted [1]	1987 estimates	1987 recommendations	1987 recommendations compared with—	
				1986 appropriations [1]	1987 budget estimates
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	2,700,804,000	3,069,500,000	3,226,052,000	+525,248,000	+156,552,000
Title II—Department of the Interior	744,463,000	851,200,000	863,930,000	+119,467,000	+12,730,000
Title III—Department of Energy	10,693,272,000	11,483,101,000	10,847,046,000	+153,774,000	−636,055,000
Title IV—Independent agencies	617,378,000	463,842,000	610,972,000	−6,406,000	+147,130,000
Grand total of bill	14,755,917,000	15,867,643,000	15,548,000,000	+792,083,000	−319,643,000

[1] Fiscal year 1986 enacted represent appropriations after Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions.

Committee Hearings

The Committee has conducted extensive hearings on the programs and projects provided for in the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Bill for 1987. The hearings are contained in 9 published volumes totaling 12,743 pages. The Committee received testimony from officials from the executive branch, Members of Congress, Governors of several states, other state and local governmental officials and private citizens.

The bill recommended for 1987 has been developed after careful consideration of all the facts and details available to the Committee.

Status of Authorizations

Authorizing legislation for parts of the Department of Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Appalachian Regional Commission is in various stages of the legislative process. The Committee recommends that the consideration of appropriations necessary for these programs proceed in order that timely funding may be provided for the next fiscal year.

The Committee notes that H.R. 6 and its Senate counterpart, S. 1567, which authorizes new projects and programs of the Corps of Engineers, have passed their respective bodies and that the conferees are scheduled to meet in the near future to reconcile the differences in the two bills. Although the Committee has received numerous requests for legislation which would waive various cost sharing provisions contained in the authorization legislation, no such language is contained in this bill.

The Committee will be guided by whatever cost sharing provisions are contained in the final version of the legislation now pending in conference.

Application of General Reductions

The Committee has recommended bill language to provide direction for the application of General Reductions, Savings and Slippage and possible sequestrations required in FY 1987 by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

For the purposes of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations, programs, projects and activities are defined to include any and all individual items or line items listed, discussed, described, included in or in any way identified or referred to in narrative or tabular documentation or references, including but not

limited to the FY 1987 budget submission of the President and supporting justification material as subsequently altered, modified or changed by Congressional action identified in House and Senate Committee reports.

It is the intention that, for purposes of applying unspecified reductions, each program, project and activity, as defined above, shall be reduced proportionately by applying the same reduction percentage as the percentage by which the account is reduced overall. It is not intended that this be used (1) to eliminate programs, projects or activities, (2) to disproportionately reduce personnel, (3) to otherwise reorder funds or priorities, or (4) to initiate unfunded new programs, projects or activities.

Capital and Operating Expenses in This Bill

Traditional Federal budgeting does not distinguish between expenditures made for operating expenses and for construction or capital expenditures. In fact, the glossary of budget terms included in the *Budget in Brief* portion of the President's annual budget request does not include definitions of these categories of expenditures.

This Committee considers the distinction to be an important one, particularly as it applies to the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Bill. In this bill, perhaps more than any other, the investment side of expenditures for capital and construction activities is especially evident. A substantial part of this bill is for investment activities. Such projects as water supply, navigation, harbor development, irrigation, flood control and hydroelectric dams, power transmission facilities, highways and access roads, major research facilities, defense production and testing facilities and energy production facilities are all major investments characteristic of the types of expenditures made from funds appropriated in this bill.

Because this is an important distinction, the following table identifies the amount of funding recommended for operating expenses and for capital and construction expenditures in this bill.

OPERATING AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES—FISCAL YEAR 1987 ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT BILL

	Fiscal year 1987 recommendation
Operating expenses	$11,441,698,000
Capital and construction	4,106,302,000
Total	$15,548,000,000

Employment Created by This Bill

The funding recommended in the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Bill contributes to many different activities. It is often overlooked that the work resulting from these appropriations creates a large number of jobs throughout the Nation. As a point of interest, the Committee is including the following table which shows the numbers of jobs created as a result of funds recommended in this appropriation bill, along with a comparison of

prior years and the requested number. The numbers are estimates based on figures provided by the agencies funded in this bill.

EMPLOYEES FUNDED BY ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

[Man-years estimated]

Agency	Fiscal year 1985—			Fiscal year 1986—			Fiscal year 1987; recommended		
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total	Federal	Non-Federal	Total	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Corps	28,600	64,400	93,000	28,400	60,700	89,100	28,200	61,800	90,000
Bureau	8,078	15,710	23,788	8,244	13,850	22,094	8,150	13,310	21,460
DOE	13,998	131,212	145,210	14,150	127,360	141,510	14,243	125,112	139,355
ARC	7	67	74	7	62	69	7	58	65
NRC	3,498	0	3,498	3,491	0	3,491	3,369	0	3,369
TVA	2,496	50	2,470	2,470	50	2,520	1,410	20	1,430
Other	4	10	14	4	9	13	4	9	13
Total	56,681	211,469	268,054	56,766	202,031	258,797	55,383	200,309	255,692

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations adjusted, 1986	$123,478,000
Budget estimate, 1987	127,000,000
Recommended, 1987	149,411,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+25,933,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+22,411,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FC)	FT. TOULOUSE	---	---	---	750,000
(FC)	MOUNDVILLE	---	---	---	300,000
(FDP)	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	148,000	---	148,000	---
	ALASKA				
(FDP)	HOMER SPIT EROSION	297,000	---	297,000	---
(FDP)	RIVERS AND HARBORS	946,000	---	946,000	---
(N)	SOUTHCENTRAL DEEP-DRAFT NAVIGATION	163,000	---	163,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR (CP&E)	400,000	---	400,000	---
	ARIZONA				
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AZ & NM	276,000	---	506,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NOGALES WASH	85,000	---	85,000	---
(FC)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBS, RILLITO INTERIM (CP&E)	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, AZ, NM, & UTAH	---	---	470,000	---
(FDP)	PHOENIX METRO AREA (OLD CROSS CUT CANAL)	38,000	---	38,000	---
	ARKANSAS				
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, AR & AK	550,000	---	550,000	---
(FDP)	CLARKSVILLE	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FC)	NORTH LITTLE ROCK (DARK HOLLOW) (CP&E)	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, AR & LA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(COMP)	WHITE RIVER BASIN AUTHORIZATION REPORT, AR & MO	400,000	---	400,000	---
	CALIFORNIA				
(N)	BOLSA CHICA/SUNSET HARBOR STUDY	---	---	250,000	---
(FC)	CACHE CREEK BASIN (CP&E)	500,000	---	500,000	---

(SPEC)	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, STORM AND TIDAL WAVES	1,000,000	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER (CP&E)	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FDP)	IMPERIAL VAL & SAN DIEGO CO. STREAMS	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW	1,150,000	---	1,150,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN RAFAEL CANAL	260,000	---	260,000	---
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR	---	---	280,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, DRY CREEK	100,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, BLUE RIDGE	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED	---	---	500,000	---
(N)	OAKLAND INNER HARBOR (CP&E)	415,000	---	415,000	---
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR	---	---	110,000	---
(N)	POINT MUGU TO SAN PEDRO BREAKWATER	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	REDONDO BEACH (KING HARBOR)	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALIENTE CREEK STREAM GROUP	120,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER INTERIM	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE	840,000	---	840,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER INTERIM	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN & ORANGE COUNTY	600,000	---	600,000	---
(SP)	SANTA ANA RIVER (PHASE 1) (CP&E)	3,500,000	---	6,000,000	---
(RDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY (BEACH EROSION)	---	---	149,000	---
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR	---	---	220,000	---
	VENTURA MARINA (REVIEW)	175,000	---	175,000	---
	COLORADO				
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER & TRIBS ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM (PHASE I)	735,000	---	735,000	---
(FDP)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBS - NORTH OF PUEBLO	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FC)	WESTERLY CREEK (CP&E)	240,000	---	240,000	---
	COMM N. MARIANAS				
(N)	NORTHERN MARIANAS ISLANDS (COMPREHENSIVE)	50,000	---	50,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	CONNECTICUT				
(COMP)	CONN RVR BSN, AUTH REPORTS, CT, MA, NH, VT	190,000	---	190,000	---
(COMP)	LONG ISLAND SOUND-AUTHORIZATION REPORTS, CT & RI	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	NEW HAVEN HARBOR (CP&E)	450,000	---	450,000	---
(COMP)	WEST CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING	250,000	---	250,000	---
	DIST OF COLUMBIA				
(FC)	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY (1946 MOD)	---	485,000	---	485,000
	FLORIDA				
SPEC	BANANA LAKE RESTORATION	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	BISCAYNE BAY	---	---	350,000	---
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY	---	---	75,000	---
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	CLEARWATER SPOIL DISPOSAL	---	---	77,000	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS STUDY	750,000	---	750,000	---
(SP)	FLAGLER COUNTY (CP&E)	---	---	115,000	---
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR (CP&E)	90,000	---	90,000	---
(RDP)	HUDSON RIVER	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, ST JOHN'S RIVER & IWW	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	JUPITER INLET	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	MEXICO BEACH INLET (CP&E)	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL (CP&E)	---	---	250,000	---
(BE)	MONROE COUNTY (CP&E)	---	---	93,000	---
SPEC	NORTHWEST FL WATER SUPPLY STUDY	---	---	350,000	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES	50,000	---	50,000	---
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTRY (CP&E)	---	---	200,000	---
(BE)	ST. JOHNS COUNTY (CP&E)	---	---	180,000	---
(FDP)	ST. JOHNS RIVER	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	ST. MARYS RIVER BASIN, FL & GA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(RDP)	ST. PETERSBURG (ECONOMIC RESTUDY)	---	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	SUWANNEE RIVER	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	TAMPA BAY, HURRICANE EVACUATION	---	---	100,000	---
SPEC	WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER	---	---	200,000	---

	GEORGIA				
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHEAST GEORGIA REGION	259,000	---	259,000	---
(FDP)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK	100,000	---	100,000	---
	GUAM				
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN TERRITORY OF GUAM	270,000	---	270,000	---
	HAWAII				
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII - SO. KOHALA WATER SUPPLY	117,000	---	117,000	---
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII, KEOPU-HIENALOLI STREAM	130,000	---	130,000	---
	IDAHO				
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, MT, OR, & WA	1,809,000	---	1,809,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY	836,000	---	836,000	---
	ILLINOIS				
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	CHICAGO - SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN, IL & IN	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	CHICAGOLAND UNDERFLOW PLAN, PHASE 1 GDM	---	---	400,000	---
(SPEC)	DIVERSION OF LAKE MICHIGAN WATER AT CHICAGO	230,000	---	230,000	---
(FDP)	ILLINOIS RIVER BETWEEN HENRY AND NAPLES	330,000	---	330,000	---
(SP)	ILLINOIS SHORELINE EROSION	415,000	---	415,000	---
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 52 & 53, IL & KY	1,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
(FC)	LOVES PARK (CP&E)	490,000	---	490,000	---
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, PHASE I (CP&E)	---	---	230,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	INDIANA				
(FDP)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLIAN AREA	121,000	---	121,000	---
(BE)	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION (CP&E)	---	---	108,000	---
	LAKE GEORGE IN HOBART	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, PHASE I (CP&E)	273,000	---	273,000	---
(COMP)	WABASH RIVER COMP STY, IN & IL - WABASH RIVER NAVIGABILITY	200,000	---	350,000	---
	IOWA				
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT (CP&E)	---	---	150,000	---
	KANSAS				
(FDP)	ARK R & TRIBS, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULSA, OK (REMAINING)	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KS AND MO	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	DOUGLASS LAKE	---	265,000	---	265,000
(FDP)	GRAND NEOSHO RIVER, KS AND OK	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	310,000	---	310,000	---
(RDP)	WINFIELD	50,000	---	50,000	---
	KENTUCKY				
(N)	BIG SANDY RIVER, KY, WV & VA	165,000	---	165,000	---
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY,GA,AL,MS,NC,TN & VA	1,450,000	---	1,450,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER & TRIBS, STATION CAMP CREEK	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	430,000	---	430,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	2,560,000	---	2,560,000	---
(FDP)	TRADEWATER RIVER BASIN	200,000	---	200,000	---

	LOUISIANA				
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION	625,000	---	625,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - LAND LOSS AND MARSH CREATION	220,000	---	220,000	---
SPEC	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - WATER SUPPLY	430,000	---	430,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - HURRICANE PROTECTION	500,000	---	500,000	---
(SP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - SHORE & BARRIER ISLAND EROSION	240,000	---	240,000	---
(FDP)	MERMENTAU, VERMILION & CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU TECHE	460,000	---	460,000	---
	MISS RV GULF OUTLET BANK EROSION (ST. BERNARD)	---	---	160,000	---
(FC)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, SHREVEPORT,LA TO VICINITY INDEX,AR	---	---	---	520,000
(FDP)	UPPER BAYOU TECHE	140,000	---	220,000	---
	MAINE				
(FDP)	SAINT JOHN RIVER	400,000	---	400,000	---
	MARYLAND				
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MD (CP&E)	500,000	---	500,000	---
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY (SHORELINE EROSION), MD & VA	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV	700,000	---	700,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR	80,000	---	80,000	---
(FC)	MASSACHUSETTS COASTAL, ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE (CP&E)	300,000	---	300,000	---
(COMP)	SOUTHEASTERN NEW ENG AUTH. REPORTS, MA, RI & CT	223,000	---	223,000	---
	MICHIGAN				
(FDP)	GREAT LAKES PARTICULARLY LAKE ONTARIO & LAKE ERIE - OVERALL	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	SAGINAW RIVER	900,000	---	900,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	MINNESOTA				
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI (CP&E)	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FC)	EAST GRAND FORKS	---	512,000	---	512,000
(FDP)	MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MN AND ND	470,000	---	870,000	---
(FC)	ROOT RIVER AT HOUSTON (CP&E)	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	TWIN VALLEY LAKE, WILD RICE RIVER	---	138,000	---	138,000
	MISSISSIPPI				
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI GULF COASTAL AREAS	215,000	---	215,000	---
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR (CP&E)	---	---	900,000	---
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER BASIN, MS & LA	590,000	---	590,000	---
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SHOCCOE DAM (CP&E)	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FDP)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	990,000	---	990,000	---
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY (CP&E)	425,000	---	425,000	---
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON METRO AREA (CP&E)	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	CREVE COEUR CREEK	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	HANNIBAL	---	124,000	---	124,000
(FC)	MALINE CREEK (CP&E)	465,000	---	465,000	---
(SPEC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN	480,000	---	480,000	---
(FDP)	OSAGE RIVER BASIN, MO, ABOVE HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM	275,000	---	275,000	---
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH, MO AND VICINITY	210,000	---	210,000	---
(N)	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL (CP&E)	---	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN AREA, MO & IL	1,054,000	---	1,054,000	---

	NEBRASKA				
(FDP)	PLATTE RIVER BASIN, NE, WY AND CO	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FC)	PAPILLON CREEK & TRIBS LAKES (CP&E)	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	REPUBLICAN RIVER, HARLAN COUNTY DAM TO MILFORD LAKE, NE & KS	135,000	---	135,000	---
(RCP)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES	145,000	---	145,000	---
	NEVADA				
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBUTARIES	320,000	---	320,000	---
	NEW JERSEY				
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA & DE	850,000	---	850,000	---
(FDP)	ELIZABETH RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	195,000	---	195,000	---
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, SEC 201, 70	---	---	---	132,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	NY HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS NJ & NY	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN STUDY, NJ & NY (PHASE 1)	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, ROBINSON'S BRANCH, AT RAHWAY (CP&E)	35,000	---	35,000	---
(FC)	RAMAPO & MAHWAH RVRS AT MAHWAH, NJ & SUFFERN, NY (PH-1) (CP&E)	170,000	---	170,000	---
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN (CP&E)	1,370,000	---	1,370,000	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO	---	330,000	---	330,000
(RCP)	LAS CRUCES	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	MID RIO GRANDE BERNALILLO TO BELEN (CP&E)	475,000	---	475,000	---
(FDP)	PECOS RIVER AND TRIBS - ROSWELL	95,000	---	95,000	---
(FDP)	PECOS RIVER AND TRIBS - CARLSBAD	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM & CO	500,000	---	550,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY - TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY,SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE	---	500,000	---	500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	NEW YORK				
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL TO FRESH KILL, NJ-EXTENSION.....	---	---	250,000	---
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL-HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL (CP&E).....	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	BUFFALO METRO AREA (BUFFALO RV & TONAWANDA CREEK).....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	CATTARAUGUS CREEK.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(BE)	ERIE CO ALONG LAKE ERIE & NIAGARA RIVER.....	---	---	100,000	---
(COMP)	GENESEE RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SP)	LAKE ONTARIO - ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SHORELINE PROTECTION STUDY.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	MOOSE & BLACK RIVERS.....	340,000	---	340,000	---
(FC)	SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD AND GREENBURGH.....	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET.....	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY ADDDITIONAL LOCKS.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CO. STREAMS - MAMARONECK & SHELDRAKE RIVERS (CP&E).....	350,000	---	350,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FDP)	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT.....	460,000	---	710,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE PEE DEE & PEE DEE RIVERS, NC & SC.....	450,000	---	450,000	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR.....	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER.....	465,000	---	465,000	---
(SP)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR-NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER (CP&E)....	250,000	---	250,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(RDP)	CANNONBALL RIVER AT MOTT.....	145,000	---	145,000	---
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT.....	---	695,000	---	695,000
(FDP)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN.....	600,000	---	600,000	---

	OHIO				
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY	435,000	---	435,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY, GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS INTERIM	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	HOLES CREEK AT WEST CARROLLTON AND MORAINE (CP&E)	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR (CP&E)	200,000	---	200,000	---
(BE)	MAUMEE BAY STATE PARK (CP&E)	---	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	MIAMI RIVER, LITTLE MIAMI R & MILL CR BASINS	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	MUSKINGUM RIVER (WOLF CR & TUSCARAWAS RV INTERIM STUDY)	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NORTH CHILLICOTHE (CP&E)	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SPEC)	OHIO RIVER BETWEEN RIVERMILE 40-491 (WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT)	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	OTTAWA	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	SANDUSKY RIVER	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER	190,000	---	190,000	---
	OKLAHOMA				
(COMP)	ARK RIV & TRIBS SC&SE OF OK (COMP. STUDY)	600,000	---	750,000	---
(FDP)	CANADIAN RIVER AND TRIBS, OK, TX, AND NM (REMAINING)	155,000	---	155,000	---
(N)	CENTRAL OKLAHOMA PROJECT	150,000	---	---	---
(RCP)	HUGO LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	229,000	---	229,000	---
(SPEC)	LUKFATA LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	---	---	55,000	---
(FC)	MINGO CREEK (CP&E)	423,000	---	423,000	---
(FC)	PARKER LAKE (CP&E)	---	---	950,000	---
(RCP)	PINE CREEK LAKE (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	---	---	30,000	---
(COMP)	RED RIVER BASIN, OK, AR, LA & TX (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY)	800,000	---	1,150,000	---
	OREGON				
(FDP)	UMPQUA RIVER & TRIBS	565,000	---	565,000	---
(COMP)	WILLAMETTE RIV BASIN	378,000	---	378,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FDP)	LACKAWANNA RIVER	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LEHIGH RIVER BASIN	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN (CP&E)	200,000	---	682,000	---
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE (MOD)	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA BASIN AT HARRISBURG (CP&E)	540,000	---	540,000	---
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY (LEVEE RAISING) (PH-1) (CP&E)	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	PUERTO RICO				
(FDP)	ARECIBO RIVER	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GUANAJIBO RIVER	255,000	---	255,000	---
(FC)	PUERTO NUEVO RIVER (CP&E)	---	---	1,500,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA	208,000	---	208,000	---
	RHODE ISLAND				
(N)	BRISTOL HARBOR	---	40,000	---	40,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(FDP)	GILLS CREEK	116,000	---	116,000	---
(SP)	MYRTLE BEACH	---	---	200,000	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FDP)	MISSOURI RIVER, SD, NE, ND, MT	618,000	---	618,000	---
	TENNESSEE				
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE	300,000	---	300,000	---
	TEXAS				
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR (42-FOOT PROJECT) (CP&E)	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	BRAZOS RIV & TRIBS, TX & NM	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	302,000	---	302,000	---
(FDP)	CAMERON COUNTY	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	DICKINSON BAYOU	255,000	---	255,000	---
(FDP)	HILLEBRANDT BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	50,000	---	50,000	---

(FDP)	LITTLE CYPRESS CREEK, TX & LA	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE FOSSIL CREEK, VICINITY OF HALTOM CITY	225,000	---	225,000	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER AND TRIBS ABOVE DENISON DAM, TX, OK & NM (REMAINING)	---	---	210,000	---
(MP)	ROCKLAND LAKE	---	450,000	---	---
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER & TRIBUTARIES	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU AT HOUSTON (CP&E)	745,000	---	745,000	---
(N)	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT) (CP&E)	800,000	---	800,000	---
(MP)	TRINITY RIVER, CHANNEL TO LIBERTY	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	UPPER WHITE OAK BAYOU & TRIBS, VICINITY OF HOUSTON (CP&E)	745,000	---	745,000	---
	UTAH				
(FDP)	GREAT SALT LAKE	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN	200,000	---	200,000	---
	VIRGINIA				
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA (CP&E)	480,000	---	480,000	---
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER, UPPER BASIN	500,000	---	500,000	---
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH (HURRICANE PROTECTION) (CP&E)	900,000	---	900,000	---
	WASHINGTON				
(N)	BELLINGHAM HARBOR	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	BLAIR AND SITCUM WATERWAYS (CP&E)	---	---	450,000	---
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER AT SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS (CP&E)	147,000	---	147,000	---
(FDP)	CHEHALIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	94,000	---	94,000	---
(N)	EAST WEST & DUWAMISH WW SEATTLE HARBOR (CP&E)	750,000	---	750,000	---
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR CHEHALIS AND HOQUIAM RIVERS (CP&E)	770,000	---	770,000	---
(FDP)	MILL CREEK BASIN STUDY	260,000	---	260,000	---
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR	150,000	---	150,000	---
(COMP)	PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS	351,000	---	351,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(COMP)	KANAWHA BASIN COMPREHENSIVE (AUTHORIZATION REPORTS), WV,VA & NC	175,000	---	175,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER	650,000	---	650,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS				
	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECTS (SEC. 216)	---	---	550,000	---
	ALAMO DAM, ARIZ.	---	---	(200,000)	---
	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	---	---	(350,000)	---
	REVIEW FOR DEAUTHORIZATION	200,000	---	---	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	6,750,000	---	6,600,000	---
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA				
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	535,000	---	535,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	380,000	---	380,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	100,000	---	100,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	8,800,000	---	8,800,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	260,000	---	260,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	130,000	---	130,000	---
	COASTAL DATA COLLECTION	1,800,000	---	1,800,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	600,000	---	600,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	235,000	---	235,000	---
	TOTAL	12,840,000	---	12,840,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	23,000,000	---	23,700,000	---
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	121,661,000	5,339,000	142,820,000	6,591,000
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	127,000,000		149,411,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC)	SPECIAL
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(PHASE I)	AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

St. Johns River, Florida.—The funds available for the lower St. Johns River enhancement study may only be expended if the study includes within its scope an evaluation of the recreational opportunities to be available over the course of the next 20 years through the use of Quarantine Island, Buck Island and Reed Island in the St. Johns River.

Northern California Streams—American River Watershed, California.—The bill includes $500,000 for the Corps to engage in a one-year reconnaissance study of alternate means of flood control in the American River, California, watershed predicated on the assumption that an Auburn Dam as previously authorized will not be constructed. The Corps is to solicit and evaluate proposals to resolve this compelling problem from the range of interests who have indicated concerns, and to work with the Bureau of Reclamation and State and local government entities to take maximum advantage of their expertise and research already performed. The Committee anticipates that focusing on flood control as the primary objective of further Corps or Bureau projects in the watershed, as opposed to irrigation, might yield a different and more acceptable approach than the traditional Auburn Dam appears to be.

Santa Ana River, California.—The Committee reiterates its previous instructions to proceed with the planning and engineering of all elements of the project concurrently. The Committee notes that the Board of Engineers for River and Harbors has taken favorable action on the report for the Upper Santa Ana Dam and that the Corps has since undertaken continuation of planning and engineering on the dam. The Committee directs that the Corps accelerate the planning and engineering effort on the Upper Santa Ana River Dam so that the Phase II design memorandum for the overall project will be completed as a single project document and construction could proceed on elements of the project in both the upstream and downstream areas concurrently. The Committee understands that in order to accomplish the intent of this direction, the Corps may have to increase the level of funding for the Santa Ana project. Accordingly, the Committee has provided $6,000,000, an increase of $2,500,000 over the budget, in order to maintain efficient progress on work in Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties and to complete a single general design memorandum. The Committee also wishes to reemphasize its conviction that this project, anticipated to cost over $1 billion, maximize the extent to which water conservation becomes a benefit, and reiterates its expectation as set forth in the conference report on the fiscal year 1986 bill that the existing Prado Dam also be operated for water conservation consistent with agreements between local governmental entities.

Arkansas River Basin, Arkansas and Oklahoma.—None of the funds provided in this bill shall be utilized to implement the proposed modification of the current Arkansas River System Operation Plan until a complete basin reevalution study has been completed that shows the proposed modifications will result in no significant adverse impact on navigation, recreation or flood control on the upstream lake system in Oklahoma, except that such modification of the System Operation Plan may be implemented for an interim period not to exceed 18 months if (1) the change is mutual-

ly agreed upon by navigation and recreation interests affected by the change; (2) the Tulsa and Little Rock Districts of the Corps of Engineers are directed to conduct a full and complete basin re-evaluation study during this interim period; and, (3) Wister Lake and Eufaula Lake in Oklahoma are both exempted from any change during the interim period because of the ongoing dam safety study by the Corps at Wister and the recently implemented lakeshore management plan at Eufaula Lake.

Coordination Studies With Other Agencies, States and non-Federal Interests.—The bill includes $200,000, an increase of $100,000 over the budget, for Section 22 studies in the State of Oklahoma.

Arkansas River and Tributaries, South Central and Southeast Areas of Oklahoma (Comprehensive).—The Committee has included $750,000, an increase of $150,000 over the budget, for the comprehensive study of the Arkansas River and Tributaries in South Central and Southeast areas of Oklahoma. The Committee notes that this study was delayed by the Corps three months, despite provision of adequate appropriations in the past and legislation which requires the study to be completed at full Federal expense.

The Corps is directed to conduct this study in accordance with the guidance the Committee provided the Corps in conjunction with the Energy and Water Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1984. Specifically, the study shall recommend measures for the control of floods, development of water supply, treatment, and conveyance facilities, irrigation, chloride control, development of solar pond powerplants and related facilities, the generation of hydro-electric power including pump back storage, the development and enhancement of the recreation potentials and enterprises of the region, the improvement of the rivers for navigation and port site development where this would further industrial development at less cost than would the improvement of other modes of transportation, the conservation and efficient utilization of the land resources, and other such measures as may be found necessary to achieve the objectives of these comprehensive efforts.

The Committee emphasizes that this increase provides funding at the full capability level of the Corps for this study, and the Committee consequently expects completion of the study by September 1988.

Lukfata Lake (Hydropower Study), Oklahoma.—The bill includes $55,000 for the Lukfata Lake hydropower study. The Committee expects the Corps to utilize these funds to complete the required studies for hydropower and resolution of the endangered species issues at the Lake.

Parker Lake, Oklahoma (CP&E).—The bill includes $950,000 for the Continuation of Planning and Engineering effort at Parker Lake. The Committee is highly supportive of this project, and both the Office of Management and Budget and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works have indicated in writing their support of the completion of ongoing Parker Lake planning and engineering by the Corps of Engineers. The Committee directs the Corps to utilize the funds provided in the bill for Parker Lake to complete all of the originally planned Advanced Engineering and Design work, including completion of the first set of plans and specifications required to initiate construction.

Pine Creek Lake (Hydropower Study), Oklahoma.—The bill includes $30,000 for the completion of the Pine Creek Lake hydropower study in fiscal year 1987.

Red River Basin, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.—The bill includes $1,150,000 for funding at the full capability level for the Red River Basin comprehensive study in Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas, which is $350,000 over the budgeted amount of $800,000. The Committee notes that this study was delayed by the Corps six months, despite provision of adequate appropriations in the past and legislation requiring the study to be completed at full Federal expense.

The Corps is directed to conduct this study in accordance with the guidance the Committee provided the Corps in conjunction with the Energy and Water Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1984. Specifically, the study shall recommend measures for the control of floods, development of water supply, treatment, and conveyance facilities, irrigation, chloride control, development of solar pond powerplants and related facilities, the generation of hydro-electric power including pump back storage, the development and enhancement of the recreation potentials and enterprises of the region, the improvement of the rivers for navigation and port site development where this would further industrial development at less cost than would the improvement of other modes of transportation, the conservation and efficient utilization of the land resources, and other such measures as may be found necessary to achieve the objectives of these comprehensive efforts.

The Committee directs the Corps to utilize these funds to accelerate the Tuskahoma interim report and to complete the comprehensive study by September 1988.

Denison Dam (Lake Texoma), Texas and Oklahoma, Restudy.—The Committee notes that although no funds are budgeted for fiscal year 1987 for the Denison Dam (Lake Texoma) restudy, the Corps has indicated that prior appropriations will remain available for continuation of the study in fiscal year 1987. The Committee expects completion of the restudy in March 1987.

Water Resources-Based Economic Development Computer Model.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue design and testing of the water resources-based economic development computer model.

Technology Transfer Demonstration Program.—The Corps of Engineers is directed to continue to develop the existing technology transfer demonstration program by expanding the Corps direct assistance on how to increase the transfer of technology from the Corps of Engineers and how to generate a greater utilization of such technology for beneficial uses. The Committee has provided an additional $400,000 for a higher level of participation toward accomplishing this purpose.

Ventura Marina, California.—The attention of the Corps is called to the colloquy of July 16, 1985, in connection with the FY 1986 appropriation bill, P.L. 99-141. This colloquy clearly stated that the feasibility phase of the Ventura Marina study was to be conducted at full Federal expense. The Committee has been informed that notwithstanding these facts the Corps has requested the local interests to share the study costs. Because the Corps

design was deficient, the Committee directs that the Corps proceed with the feasibility phase at full Federal expense as previously directed.

Galveston Harbor and Channel, Texas.—The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to review the completed Galveston Harbor and Channel project under the provisions of Section 216 of the 1970 Flood Control Act (P.L. 91-611), at full Federal expense within available funds for the purposes of developing and evaluating alternative disposable sites to the currently active San Jacinto disposal area on Galveston Island, preparing a report with recommendations on the advisability of modifying the project operation, and preparing an EIS.

Northern California Streams—Blue Ridge, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps to commence a reconnaissance study in collaboration with the Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District into the feasibility of flood control components to a proposed Blue Ridge reservoir project, in response to request of the YCWCFCD and the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.

Rio Grande and Tributaries, New Mexico and Colorado (Hernandez, NM).—The Committee allowance of $550,000 for the Rio Grande and Tributaries, New Mexico and Colorado, study includes an increase of $50,000 to address flood control problems at Hernandez, New Mexico, and to perform an initial appraisal report.

Tangier Island, Virginia.—The Committee continues to be concerned about the serious erosion problems being experienced at Tangier Island, Virginia. The regular FY 1985 Energy and Water Development Appropriation Bill and the FY 1985 Supplemental Appropriations Bill directed the Corps to update the project design and cost estimates in order that construction can begin at the earliest possible time. The Committee notes that since passage of the Supplemental Bill the erosion has continued unabated. Therefore, the Committee directs the obligation of funds previously appropriated in order that this important project can proceed in an expeditious manner.

Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout, North Carolina.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to broaden the scope of the Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout Study to include hydrology, water quality, and land use issues, in addition to the flood control information now being generated by the study. Particular attention should be paid to cooperating with the Environmental Protection Agency in support of its National Estuary Study for the Albermarle and Pamlico Sounds in North Carolina. The Committee has added $250,000 to the budgeted Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout study for this purpose.

Chicagoland Underflow Plan, Illinois.—The bill provides $400,000 for continuation of planning and engineering for the Chicagoland Underflow Plan, including $200,000 for the O'Hare System and $200,000 for the Mainstream, Des Plaines, and Calumet Systems.

Antelope Valley, California.—The Chief of Engineers is authorized and hereby directed to perform a focused study of the drainage basin for Rosamond and Rogers Dry Lakes, site of Edwards Air Force Base in the Antelope Valley, to determine the effect of

storms that could be expected to occur once every 5, 10, 25, 50 and 100 years with and without the facilities proposed to be built in the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Comprehensive Plan for Flood Control and Water Conservation for the Antelope Valley, considering runoff from Los Angeles, Kern and San Bernardino Counties. The Chief of Engineers is further authorized and directed to determine what facilities should be added to, or modified within the Los Angeles County Comprehensive Plan in order to optimize flood flows entering the dry lakes. Funds for this study shall be provided from unexpended funds in the FY 1986 appropriation for the Antelope Valley Streams Study.

North Branch of the Chicago River, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $230,000 to the Army Corps of Engineers for completion of the design and engineering phase of the North Branch of the Chicago River Flood Control Project. The Committee recognizes the urgent need and ultimate cost savings to the Federal Government of this project, and is committed to ensuring the necessary funding for its eventual completion. It is the Committee's desire that construction commence as soon as possible.

San Timoteo Creek, California.—The Committee is aware of the progress being made on the San Timoteo Creek study and encourages the Corps of Engineers to assure that all reasonable alternative solutions to the flooding problems are considered. Where appropriate the Corps of Engineers should pursue solutions to localized flooding problems using its continuing authorities program.

Papillion Creek and Tributaries, Nebraska.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with continuation of planning and engineering in accordance with the plan contained in the reevaluation report for Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes, Nebraska, March 1985 (revised October 1985). This bill provides $300,000 for this plan, total cost of the modified project being estimated at $7,000,000, instead of $120 million as originally authorized. The bill authorizes construction as contemplated in the reevaluation report and deauthorizes features eliminated from the original authorization adopted in 1968.

Red River of the North, Minnesota.—In addition to the continuation of ongoing work under the general basin authorization for the Red River of the North, the Committee has included $400,000 for a restudy of the Wild Rice, Marsh Rivers. The project includes a reconnaissance level study of the feasibility of undertaking work on the lower 18 miles of the Wild Rice River channel to reduce flood hazards in the area, as well as to reduce operation and maintenance costs for the downstream portion of the project.

Illinois Beach State Park, Illinois.—The committee directs the Corps of Engineers to send the Illinois Beach erosion control study through the appropriate review channels. The committee has provided such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of completing this review.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$879,830,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,072,500,000
Recommended, 1987	1,187,734,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1986	+307,904,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+155,234,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA			
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR	228,980,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	THREEMILE CREEK, MOBILE	9,470,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK	24,000,000	---	4,000,000
(N)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK & DAM REPLACEMENT	65,000,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
	ALASKA			
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES	209,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(MP)	SNETTISHAM	139,000,000	10,800,000	10,800,000
	ARIZONA			
(FC)	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY (STAGE 2)	232,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
	ARKANSAS			
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU IN THE VICINITY OF LITTLE ROCK	18,260,000	760,000	760,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK	545,590,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	272,000,000	7,880,000	9,080,000
	CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK	14,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE	343,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS	9,630,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	FISHERMAN'S WHARF AREA	8,900,000	550,000	550,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES DRAINAGE AREA (MAJOR REHAB)	29,700,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
(FC)	LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	5,600,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS	57,900,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE	382,000,000	1,900,000	3,500,000
(N)	OAKLAND OUTER HARBOR	14,900,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER	1,820,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	PORT HUENEME HARBOR (UNSTARTED SEPARABLE ELEMENT)	2,501,000	1,020,000	1,020,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS	55,200,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR	19,300,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT	74,950,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT	90,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, CHICO LANDING TO RED BLUFF	30,000,000	600,000	600,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL	52,700,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES	11,900,000	200,000	200,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON	138,000,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER	29,700,000	---	1,500,000
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER	24,600,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK	62,800,000	11,100,000	11,100,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS	17,600,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	COLORADO			
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE	95,500,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AT PUEBLO, COLORADO	5,910,000	---	1,360,000
	DELAWARE			
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION,DE,1968 ACT	129,000,000	---	575,000
	FLORIDA			
(BE)	BROWARD COUNTY (REIMBURSEMENT)	18,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	26,300,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(FC)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	767,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
	CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL (LAND ACQUISITION)	---	---	11,000,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY	48,600,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, NORTH OF HAULOVER BEACH PARK	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY	16,600,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	187,000,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, MILL COVE	4,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR (CLEANUP)	5,000,000	---	200,000
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY (REIMBURSEMENT)	10,900,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY	19,100,000	1,600,000	3,000,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR BRANCH CHANNELS	42,800,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
	GEORGIA			
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	541,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR	8,235,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(BE)	TYBEE ISLAND	5,635,000	2,005,000	2,005,000
	GUAM			
(FC)	AGANA RIVER, GUAM	3,960,000	700,000	700,000
	HAWAII			
(FC)	KAHOMA STREAM, MAUI	16,800,000	6,500,000	6,500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ILLINOIS			
(N)	BRANDON ROAD LOCK AND DAM, ILLINOIS RIVER (REHAB)	24,400,000	5,470,000	5,470,000
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	13,200,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(N)	LOCK & DAM 26, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALTON, IL & MO	748,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAM 53, IL & KY (REHAB)	140,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	MAUVAISE TERRE DRAINAGE & LEVEE DISTRICT	9,240,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	ROCKFORD	1,100,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL, IN & KY	10,140,000	950,000	950,000
(FC)	SOUTH QUINCY LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT	275,800,000	486,000	486,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENVIR MANGMENT PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN, & WI	9,670,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
		196,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
	INDIANA			
(FC)	EVANSVILLE	49,800,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
(N)	FALLS OF OHIO NATL WILDLIFE CONSER AREA, IN & KY	1,200,000	---	900,000
	IOWA			
(FC)	AMES LAKE	58,100,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	BETTENDORF	14,500,000	1,618,000	1,618,000
(FC)	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER AND GREENBELT (DRAG)	4,750,000	350,000	350,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	248,000,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK	42,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE	---	---	1,000,000
	KANSAS			
(FC)	GREAT BEND	43,535,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
(FC)	HALSTEAD	5,812,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM & LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	16,200,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA, KY & TN	103,522,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY	57,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE	90,100,000	---	6,800,000
	LOUISIANA			
(FC)	GRAND ISLE & VIC,LA SEC 201, 1976 ACT	10,343,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	511,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	64,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(N)	MISS RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	357,000,000	19,400,000	21,400,000
(N)	MISS RIVER-GULF OUTLET	491,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE	168,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	164,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL, ST. TAMMANY PARISH	17,742,000	750,000	750,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, LA, AR, OK, & TX	65,300,000	---	4,500,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	1,582,000,000	38,000,000	68,000,000
	MAINE			
(N)	JONESPORT HARBOR	8,850,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
	MARYLAND			
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD & VA (50 FT DEEPENING)	174,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS (BREWERTON CHANNEL)	43,300,000	5,000,000	6,400,000
	MASSACHUSETTS			
(BE)	REVERE BEACH	5,170,000	700,000	700,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY, AND BRAINTREE	21,500,000	---	2,800,000
	MINNESOTA			
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK	26,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO	98,200,000	8,800,000	8,800,000
	SILVER BAY HARBOR OF REFUGE	---	---	675,000
(FC)	SOUTH FORK ZUMBRO RIVER AT ROCHESTER	53,000,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
	MISSISSIPPI			
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR	36,900,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	SOWASHEE CREEK, MERIDIAN	11,250,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	50,000,000	4,900,000	4,900,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	141,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM & MARK TWAIN LAKE	330,000,000	---	1,300,000
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	550,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES	137,000,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE	20,453,000	500,000	500,000
	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN - FLOOD FORECASTING/ FLOOD WARNING SYSTEM	880,000	---	330,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	181,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	21,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	48,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE			
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME	14,300,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	NEW JERSEY			
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET	24,250,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(N)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP	17,900,000	---	913,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF CAMDEN	2,870,000	2,650,000	2,650,000
(FC)	LIBERTY STATE PARK LEVEE AND SEAWALL	19,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET	---	---	2,300,000
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	3,060,000	2,060,000	2,060,000
	NEW YORK			
(FC)	ARDSLEY	4,430,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK	13,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL & NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	191,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(N)	MORICHES INLET	5,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	NY HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY & NJ	50,800,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
(N)	PORT ONTARIO	2,760,000	800,000	800,000
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE	136,000,000	8,700,000	8,700,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	168,000,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
(FC)	RANDLEMAN LAKE	111,400,000	---	3,000,000
	NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	LAKE DARLING, SOURIS RIVER	59,200,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	OHIO			
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR	5,850,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
(N)	GENEVA-ON-THE-LAKE	4,610,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK	156,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (REHAB)	24,900,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	NEWARK	9,600,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE	84,300,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
	EUFAULA LAKE (BRIDGE REPLACEMENT)	1,700,000	---	390,000
(FC)	PARKER LAKE	48,960,000	---	7,000,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE	61,003,000	---	300,000
	OREGON			
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA	101,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA	663,000,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	25,400,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	29,800,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	PENNSYLVANIA			
(FC)	CONANESQUE LAKE (MODIFICATION)	2,690,000	470,000	470,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM MODIFICATION	14,400,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK & DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER	60,500,000	670,000	4,200,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY LOCKS AND DAMS, OHIO RIVER (REHAB)	33,200,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
(N)	POINT MARION, LOCK & DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA & WV	35,050,000	730,000	730,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA	16,291,000	1,210,000	1,210,000
(FC)	TAMAQUA	8,540,000	---	1,340,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK	17,366,000	300,000	300,000
	PUERTO RICO			
(N)	PONCE HARBOR	7,328,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS	317,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	TEXAS			
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBS-ADDICKS & BARKER DAMS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	14,600,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK	78,141,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
(FC)	COLORADO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BOGGY CREEK AT AUSTIN	15,800,000	900,000	900,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	140,000,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(FC)	EL PASO	58,500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR	72,700,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE	70,153,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS	190,000,000	9,700,000	9,700,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER	30,000,000	700,000	700,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE	29,600,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	282,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
(FC)	SAN GABRIEL RIVER	87,300,000	11,600,000	11,600,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU	125,800,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOUS	52,700,000	8,600,000	8,600,000
(N)	WALLISVILLE LAKE TRINITY RIV 1962 ACT NAV	19,600,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
		67,700,000	---	100,000
	UTAH			
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE	50,300,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
	VIRGINIA			
(FC)	HAYSI LAKE	20,900,000	---	1,000,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING)	154,460,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	RICHMOND	72,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	VIRGINIA BEACH STREAMS, CANAL NO. TWO	4,600,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH (REIMB)	5,500,000	530,000	530,000
	WASHINGTON			
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS	387,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR & ID	177,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS & VICINITY (INTERIM MEASURES)	51,558,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL	148,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	23,800,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA			
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS & DAM, WV & OH	176,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	LEVISA/TUG FORKS OF BIG SANDY & UPPER CUMBERLAND RVRS, WV, VA, & KY	247,000,000	22,500,000	27,900,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE	250,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE	206,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCK AND DAM	64,000,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
	MISCELLANEOUS			
	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	---	6,900,000	10,763,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NAVIGATION PROJECTS	---	300,000	300,000
	SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	2,100,000	5,408,000
	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL & RELATED PURPOSES (SECTION 205)	---	30,000,000	34,100,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14)	---	7,500,000	9,400,000
	SMALL SNAGGING & CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208)	---	1,200,000	1,450,000
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)	---	8,000,000	8,000,000
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	---	10,973,000	10,973,000
	DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM	---	21,000,000	21,000,000
	FUNDS DERIVED FROM INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND	---	26,000,000	26,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-51,732,000	-51,732,000
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL		1,072,500,000	1,187,734,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC)	SPECIAL
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(PHASE I)	AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff, California.—The Committee expects that any expenditures made for the Chico Landing to Red Bluff project will be made consistent with direction in the Committee's fiscal year 1986 report.

Eufaula Lake, Oklahoma (Bridge Replacement).—The Committee has provided $390,000 to complete the design and construction of the replacement bridges on Piney Creek and Muddy Creek at Eufaula Lake, Oklahoma.

Parker Lake, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $7,000,000 for the initial purchase of land at the Parker Lake site and construction of the access road and project facility.

Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes, Nebraska.—With respect to the Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes project that would provide flood protection and recreation facilities to the expanding metropolitan area of Omaha, the Committee is aware of the water quality problems associated with Dam Site 18.

The effluent from two upstream Sanitary Improvement Districts (SID's) is discharged into Boxelder Creek which now feeds the new reservoir. Both facilities have met the conditions of their NPDES discharge permits issued by the State of Nebraska, Department of Environmental Control. With the development of Site 18, the state and local Health Departments have determined the discharge quality is incompatible with the recreational uses of the impounded waters.

The Committee notes that state and local interests have developed a mutually acceptable solution that resolves the water quality problem. The Committee also notes the solution consists of construction of a storage facility to prevent the discharges from reaching Site 18, currently estimated to cost $1,086,000.

The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to provide funds for design and construction of the storage facility to include necessary conveyances. The funds are to be provided from funds previously appropriated for the Papillion Creek project.

Small Snagging and Clearing Projects (Section 208).—The bill includes $250,000 for clearing of the Poteau River channel where it flows as a tributary into the Arkansas River in Southeast Oklahoma.

Levisa/Tug Forks of Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers, West Virginia, Kentucky and Virginia.—The Committee continues to be concerned by the slow pace of activity on the Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy River in Kentucky and Virginia as authorized by P.L. 96-367, Sec. 202. The Committee expects that the Corps of Engineers shall complete the plan for the Levisa Fork no later than December 1986. The bill contains a total of $27,900,000 for this project, including $1,100,000 for Barbourville, KY; $3,600,000 for Harlan, KY; and $700,000 for South Williamson, KY.

Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The allowance provided by the Committee includes $3,000,000 for the Morrison Creek, California, project; $100,000 for the East Fork, 102 River at Bedford, Iowa, project; $300,000 for the Salyersville, Kentucky, project; $300,000 for the Ganado Dam, Arizona, project and $400,000 for the Noyes, Minnesota, project.

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The bill includes $100,000 for the Kahului Harbor, Hawaii, project; $1,500,000 for the

Laupahoehoe Point Navigation Improvement project, Hawaii; $100,000 for the Shell Point, Florida, project; $1,600,000 for the Sturgeon Point Marina, New York, project; $300,000 for the Sheffield Lake, Ohio, project; $200,000 for the Dillingham, Alaska, project; and $63,000 for the North Shore Channel Marina, Illinois project.

Small Beach Erosion Control Projects (Section 103).—The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Sand Island Shoreline, Hawaii, project; $748,000 for the Orchard Beach, New York, project; $625,000 for the Indian River Inlet (North Shore), Delaware, project; $685,000 for the Indian River Inlet (South Shore), Delaware, project; and $250,000 for the Century Park, Ohio, project.

Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection (Section 14.)—The bill includes $100,000 for the Cox Run area of the Wellsburg, West Virginia, project; $100,000 for the Middle School area of the Wellsburg project; $450,000 to protect the water works along the Ohio River in the vicinity of 10th Street in Wellsburg; and $175,000 to protect Main Street from 2nd to 5th Streets in Wellsburg. The bill also includes $75,000 for Sistersville, West Virginia, and $500,000 for Glen Dale, West Virginia.

Wallisville Lake, Texas.—The Committee notes that Congressional reauthorization of this project in the FY 1983 Supplemental Appropriations Bill has been held by a U.S. District Court to be "fatally flawed" because it was not "a well informed decision". This holding is being appealed and the Committee is confident that this display of judicial interference will be struck down. Therefore, the Committee has included $100,000 for resumption of construction of this much needed and long overdue project as soon as the district court's injunction is lifted.

Haysi Lake, Virginia.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for continued planning of the Haysi Lake in Virginia under authority of Section 202 of Public Law 96–367.

Central and Southern Florida.—The Committee notes that funds are included in the budget for construction of flood control measures in the Upper St. John's River Basin under the Central and Southern Florida authorized project. The Committee directs the Corps to proceed with the current recommended plan which has been approved by State and local officials.

John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee supports the ongoing construction of fish passage facilities at the John Day Lock and Dam, which will ensure the passage of juvenile salmon and steelhead around this project. Therefore, the Committee supports the transfer of available construction funds into the John Day project, if required, to complete the construction of the fish passage facilities.

Black River-Clover Bend, Arkansas.—The Committee is aware that extensive and increasing streambank erosion is occurring on the Black River in Lawrence County, Arkansas, and that at Clover Bend such erosion is threatening the only county road available for moving harvested farm crops, with an annual value of more than $1.6 million, to market during periods of high water. The Committee intends that the Corps of Engineers shall use its authorities to develop and implement a demonstration of streambank stabilization at the Clover Bend location on the Black River, Arkansas. The

61-313 O - 86 - 2

bill contains $250,000 to initiate this needed work under the authority of Section 14, Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection.

Sardis Lake, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for construction of recreation facilities at Sardis Lake, Oklahoma, for the provision of a waterboy treatment facility so that quality drinking water may be made available in the lake area. The Committee is pleased with the recent efforts of the Corps to move forward with recreation development at Sardis Lake, and urges the Corps to complete development of the recreation areas and activities in fiscal year 1987.

Red Lake River (Gentilly), Minnesota.—The Committee is aware of serious erosion problems along the banks of the Red Lake River near Gentilly, Minnesota, which threaten nearby highway improvements. Accordingly, the Committee has included $250,000 to implement repair work under the Section 14 emergency streambank protection program.

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $2,700,000 to the Army Corps of Engineers for the Cleveland Harbor Project. The Committee recognizes that additional appropriations may be required pending the outcome of the conference on H.R. 6 and is committed to funding all of the project elements approved in the authorizing legislation.

Saylorville Lake, Iowa.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for road improvements to Highway 415 (Segment C) of Saylorville Lake, Iowa.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$23,925,000
Budget estimate, 1987	25,000,000
Recommended, 1987	25,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+1,075,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

This activity provides for flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane or shore protection works. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean drinking water where the source has been contaminated and, in drought distressed areas, provision of adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$301,225,000
Budget estimate, 1987	298,000,000
Recommended, 1987	319,460,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+18,235,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+21,460,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
	SURVEYS:			
	GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA	6,540,000	950,000	950,000
(FC)	BUSHLEY BAYOU AREA LA (CP&E)	975,000	150,000	150,000
(FDP)	BAYOU DU CHIEN, KY	995,000	243,000	243,000
(FDP)	LARTO LAKE-SALINE LAKE AREA, LA	1,410,000	116,000	216,000
(FDP)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN (WATER & LAND RESOURCES), LA	6,551,000	170,000	170,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI & LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS (CP&E)	3,900,000	780,000	1,100,000
(FC)	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBS INCLUDING COMPER CREEK, MS & TN (CP&E)	400,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	TUSCUMBIA RIVER BASIN, MS	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	YAZOO RIVER BASIN, MS	8,880,000	500,000	500,000
(FDP)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, AR	2,350,000	700,000	700,000
(FC)	ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO (CP&E)	2,800,000	428,000	428,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CR, TN & MS (CP&E)	1,300,000	800,000	800,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN	990,000	260,000	260,000
(FDP)	TIPTONVILLE, TN	355,000	105,000	105,000
(FDP)	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	270,000	270,000
	ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:			
(FC)	EASTERN RAPIDES & SOUTH CENTRAL AVOYELLES, LA	4,400,000	935,000	1,250,000
(FC)	L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR	2,900,000	655,000	655,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		7,062,000	8,297,000
	CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	3,010,000,000	75,100,000	75,100,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	7,570,000	350,000	350,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	1,229,000,000	21,700,000	24,200,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION SALINITY CONTROL STRUCTURE	---	---	500,000
(FC)	ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	361,000,000	9,200,000	9,200,000
(FC)	WEST KENTUCKY TRIBS, KY	20,955,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(443,707,000)	(5,600,000)	(5,600,000)
	BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, EXCEPT LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	133,232,000	560,000	560,000
	BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	92,300,000	815,000	815,000
	RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, EXCEPT TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT	163,775,000	2,725,000	2,725,000
	RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT	54,400,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,433,000,000	35,600,000	35,600,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	131,875,000	970,000	970,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	19,839,000	75,000	75,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	301,300,000	14,829,000	14,829,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	9,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,290,500,000)	(24,000,000)	(33,200,000)
	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER	108,000,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
	MAIN STEM	169,000,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
	TRIBUTARIES	242,000,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS (FORMERLY AUXILIARY CHANNEL)	361,958,000	14,200,000	14,200,000
	YAZOO BACKWATER	234,500,000	1,100,000	3,100,000
	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL	13,700,000	---	7,200,000
	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	104,000,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		196,524,000	208,724,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR AND LA	---	1,784,000	1,784,000
(N)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR (DEVIL'S SWAMP), LA	---	285,000	285,000
(FC)	DEVALLS BLUFF PUMPING STATION, AR	---	---	250,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	677,000	677,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	---	1,080,000	1,080,000
(FC)	MAPPING, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	662,000	662,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	7,395,000	7,395,000
(FC)	NORTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR	---	15,000	15,000
(FC)	SOUTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR	---	42,000	42,000
(FC)	ST. FRANCIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AR & MO	---	3,719,000	3,719,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	7,797,000	7,797,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	115,000	115,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE SPILLWAY, LA	---	436,000	436,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	62,000	62,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	---	5,814,000	5,814,000
(FC)	RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, LA	---	1,327,000	1,327,000
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	2,031,000	2,906,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	94,000	94,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS	---	2,300,000	3,703,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS	---	475,000	475,000
(FC)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	424,000	424,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	3,292,000	4,170,000
(FC)	YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	---	1,502,000	1,502,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	3,065,000	7,684,000
(FC)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	319,000	319,000
(FC)	YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	1,143,000	1,143,000
(FC)	WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	---	57,000	57,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER, MS	---	287,000	287,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS	---	330,000	330,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	2,771,000	2,771,000
(FC)	REVETMENT AND DIKES	---	35,138,000	35,138,000
(FC)	DREDGING	---	19,343,000	19,343,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	1,060,000	1,060,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		104,841,000	112,866,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-10,427,000	-10,427,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES		298,000,000	319,460,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION

DeValls Bluff Pumping Station, Arkansas.—The bill includes $250,000 for the repair of two 45 cfs, electrically driven pumps and other necessary elements of this flood control facility located in northeast DeValls Bluff, Arkansas, on the White River. This station protects 266 acres within the City—including many homes, a church, and a major section of the City's business district—and a segment of U.S. Highway 70. Investment in these repairs now will extend the life of the flood control facility and delay the date the Federal Government would be called upon to purchase and install new pumping facilities.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee understands that agreement has been reached on a plan for solving problems relating to the fat pocketbook pearly mussel which have been delaying flood control activities in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, project since 1978. The Committee expects and intends that the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies shall work as cooperatively and expeditiously as possible in implementing this plan so as to provide urgently needed flood control improvements to the affected region at the earliest feasible date.

Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Demonstration Erosion Control, A Joint Program of the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service.—Erosion and drainage problems in the United States are becoming more acute with every day of exponential population growth and its attendant land clearing for food and fibre production and urban development. Conversion of forests, woodlands, ranges, meadows, and wetlands to agricultural uses, including the shifting of uncultivated or little cultivated pasture and farmland to a more extensive tilled agriculture, contribute significantly to the velocity, peaking characteristics, and total volume of runoff reaching the Nation's streams and rivers. Likewise, the higher runoff rates and volumes, and the lower ground water tables being experienced through the country exemplify the hydrologic effects of increased urbanization, with its paving over of vast tracks of forest, grassland and farmlands to accommodate the growing local, regional, and national requirements for new improved highways, roads, streets, sidewalks, shopping centers, parking lots, airport runways, and the like.

The Nation's first line of defense against the flooding caused by the high runoff rates and volumes is the Corps of Engineers program of flood control and flood and hurricane damage prevention, which has cost about $20 billion and prevented about $146 billion in damages. The effectiveness of this program was just demonstrated during the flood seasons in FY 1983 and 1984 when Corps projects prevented $40 billion in damages, of which an estimated $31 billion was prevented by the Mississippi River and Tributaries project alone. Another $9.7 billion damages was prevented by the Mississippi River and Tributaries project in FY 1985.

Notwithstanding this impressive demonstration of effectiveness, there is still not room for national complacency when it comes to flooding. Despite the damages prevented by Corps projects in FY 1983 and 1984, 322 lives were lost and over 51 million acres of land were inundated by floods during those same two years. Corps studies show that within the Lower Mississippi Valley alone about 6 million acres of farmland were flooded in FY 1984. Another 1.5

million acres in the Lower Mississippi Valley were flooded in FY 1985.

Given the economic, environmental, and social losses that arise from flooding, from the loss of valuable topsoil, and from sediment pollution in the Nation's water supplies, there is no question that we must maintain our vigilance and reinforce the steps taken to date to assure that flooding, erosion, and sedimentation problems are not allowed to continue unabated. We must be concerned about how to keep the water and the soil in the uplands where it belongs, and we must employ new technology and innovation in programs to find and demonstrate economically feasible solutions.

In FY 1983, Public Law 98-8 contained legislation addressing the need for vital flood control and soil conservation work caused by disastrous hurricanes and rains which covered much of the United States, including the Lower Mississippi Valley, which drains over 40 percent of the United States. The legislation provided for cooperative work between the Corps and the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) in an effort to hold back the water in the watershed areas to prevent disastrous flooding.

Public Law 98-50, the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Bill for FY 1984 also directed the Corps and SCS to work jointly to preclude, to the maximum extent possible, drainage problems which result in massive flooding, especially in the Upper Yazoo Basin foothill area. Legislation in FY 1985 directed the continuation of this effort and provided appropriations of $6.2 million for the erosion control work program, together with repair of flood damages caused by the devastating tornado which struck the counties of Leflore, Tallahatchie, Lafayette, and Yalobusha on April 21, 1984. In FY 1986 $7.5 million was provided to continue this cooperative work. Continuation of this erosion control work in the Yazoo Basin is vital to the well being of that region, and will demonstrate feasible solutions to other parts of the Nation.

Having embarked on such a demonstration program to truly try to address the problems associated with this unique problem of trying to minimize the damages that result from destructive floods, the deposition of soil on downstream areas and the resulting flooding problems, the Corps is directed to continue this effort focusing on developing methods of erosion control that can be applied at other locations throughout this great Nation. The Nation's cropland must be protected and preserved. The recent nuclear accident in the Soviet Union reminds us that it is possible that an extremely large area of productive farmland can be rendered useless for a long period in just a matter of minutes.

The bill includes $7.2 million for fiscal year 1987 for the Demonstration Erosion Control Program, a continuation of the joint efforts undertaken between the Vicksburg District of the Corps and the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) in the Yazoo Basin.

A joint Interagency Task Force was established to develop the program. The Task Force is composed of the Soil Conservation Service, Vicksburg District, Corps of Engineers, and the Agricultural Research Service Sedimentation Laboratory. The purpose of the Task Force is to develop a comprehensive plan to reduce flooding, erosion, and sedimentation in the Yazoo Basin Foothills.

The Task Force developed a program for FY 1985 and FY 1986 that included selection of construction items for six watersheds, a determination of which agency should accomplish each item, a definition of work that will be done on the data collection and monitoring program, and continuation of preparation of technical work plans for the individual watersheds. The Vicksburg District and the Soil Conservation Service are using the FY 1985 and FY 1986 funds provided for construction of usable increments in the six demonstration watersheds and for continuation of technical work plans for the watersheds.

The Task Force has also defined usable increments of work that can be constructed in fiscal year 1987 and the work on the technical work plans that can be done in FY 1987. Listed below are the usable increments and related engineering and planning studies that could be accomplished in FY 1987 by the Corps of Engineers. The construction work will build on the knowledge gained in FY 1985 and 1986 and would expand the work already constructed toward the overall goal of reducing flooding, erosion and sedimentation in the demonstration watersheds.

The proposed FY 1987 work was jointly developed with SCS and presents the capabilities of both agencies. Funding for the ARS technology applications project, a part of this joint program, is carried in the Agriculture Appropriation Bill.

Batupan Bogue ($2,100,000)

Bank stabilization will be constructed on approximately 1 mile of streambanks in the Batupan Bogue watershed in FY 1987. Additionally, one grade control structure to maintain channel stability and reduce severe channel degradation will be constructed. Funds are also included for construction of floodwater retarding structures to limit flooding problems in the lower end of the watershed at Grenada and for land treatment in the watershed.

Otoucalofa Creek ($2,400,000)

The work will be primarily directed toward continuation of resolving the flooding problems in Water Valley by bank stabilization, flood retention structures and channel cleanout at critical locations in the downtown area of Water Valley. The work also includes 20 minor grade control structures on tributaries of Otoucalofa Creek and planning for future work.

Hotophia Creek ($500,000)

This work will be bank stabilization at critical sites (.3 miles) to supplement the work accomplished in FY 1985 and 1986 by the Corps and SCS, construction of minor grade control structures and land treatment.

Hickahala and Senatobia Creeks ($1,000,000)

These funds will be used for design and construction of one minor grade control structure, bank stabilization (.4 miles), and land treatment.

Long Creek ($1,750,000)

These funds will be used to design and construct minor grade control structures, land treatment, and for bank stabilization (1 mile) at critical locations and planning for future construction.

Black Creek ($3,500,000)

The work will include bank stabilization, channel work near the lower end of the watershed (12 miles), minor grade control structures (4), land treatment, and planning and design funds for future items of construction.

General ($1,350,000)

These funds will be used for data collection, general surveys, cultural resource investigations, water quality studies, and monitoring and evaluation. This data is important for the overall development of the technical work plans and the GDM type documents.

Yazoo Basin—Yazoo Backwater Pumping Plant.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the very fertile Yazoo Backwater Area and the extensive agricultural production so important to the regional and national economy. About 75% of the area is highly improved farmland. Unfortunately, flooding of long duration in the Yazoo Basin severely affects the area once or twice annually and causes average annual damages of over $44 million. Increased flooding in this area in the 1970's generated much concern for the need of the authorized pumping plant. The pumping plant would reduce both the frequency and duration of flooding in order to permit more effective agricultural development. The Congress has previously directed the Corps to initiate the construction of this vital project, and we understand that a contract for initial channel work is underway.

The Committee has added $2 million for FY 1987 and directs the Secretary of the Army to initiate pump and motor supply contracts, necessary relocations, and continue detailed engineering and design.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$1,263,248,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,420,000,000
Recommended, 1987	1,417,447,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+154,199,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−2,553,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
(N)	ALABAMA-COOSA RIVERS	4,924,000	7,500,000
	BAYOU CODEN	---	141,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR & TOMBIGBEE RIVERS	11,948,000	12,178,000
	BON SECOUR	---	680,000
(N)	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY	560,000	560,000
(N)	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS	134,000	293,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (MOBILE DISTRICT)	4,567,000	4,567,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY RESERVOIR	3,496,000	3,496,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR	7,112,000	9,167,000
(N)	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL	562,000	1,323,000
(MP)	ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK & DAM	3,220,000	3,220,000
(N)	TENNESSEE TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	14,323,000	14,323,000
(MP)	WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	5,252,000	5,252,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR	1,920,000	1,920,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES	797,000	797,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR	423,000	423,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR	306,000	306,000
(N)	NINILCHIK SMALL BOAT HARBOR	243,000	243,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR	1,029,000	1,029,000
(N)	STIKINE RIVER SNAGGING	13,000	13,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE	927,000	927,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM	676,000	676,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM	86,000	86,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE	3,520,000	3,520,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MOUNTAIN DAM, LAKE OUACHITA	3,219,000	3,219,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE	714,000	714,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE	5,431,000	5,431,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK & DAM	4,849,000	4,849,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE	2,757,000	2,757,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE	600,000	600,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE	704,000	704,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE	602,000	602,000
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE	3,765,000	3,765,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR	410,000	410,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK	20,433,000	20,433,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE	1,520,000	1,520,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON	2,418,000	2,418,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE	954,000	954,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE	2,932,000	2,932,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR	533,000	533,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	5,310,000	5,310,000
(MP)	OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK & DAM	3,069,000	3,069,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER	1,850,000	1,850,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE	1,158,000	1,158,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H. V. EASTMAN LAKE	1,350,000	1,350,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO)	1,567,000	1,567,000
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR	455,000	455,000
(N)	DANA POINT HARBOR	355,000	355,000
(N)	DRIFT REMOVAL (SF HARBOR & BAY)	1,380,000	1,380,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE & CHANNEL	1,772,000	1,772,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM	117,000	117,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE	1,368,000	1,368,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY	2,318,000	2,318,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE	1,880,000	1,880,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL	140,000	1,300,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS	1,457,000	1,457,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA	2,240,000	2,240,000
(N)	MARINA DEL REY	1,175,000	1,175,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS	143,000	143,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM	172,000	172,000
(N)	MOSS LANDING HARBOR	740,000	740,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE	1,145,000	1,145,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE	593,000	593,000
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR	380,000	380,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR	1,624,000	1,624,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS	1,918,000	1,918,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR	480,000	480,000
(N)	PETALUMA RIVER	3,225,000	3,225,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE	1,795,000	1,795,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR	1,745,000	1,745,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL	63,000	63,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (DEBRIS CONTROL)	675,000	675,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (30 FOOT PROJECT)	545,000	545,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE	1,029,000	1,029,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR	1,370,000	1,370,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	2,013,000	2,013,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY & MARE ISLAND STRAIT	4,640,000	4,640,000
	SAN RAFAEL CREEK	---	850,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN	1,608,000	1,608,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR	800,000	800,000
(N)	SANTA CRUZ HARBOR	---	600,000
	SEPULVEDA DAM LACDA	---	7,400,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE	1,086,000	1,086,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL	760,000	760,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH)	1,188,000	1,188,000
(N)	VENTURA MARINA	1,690,000	1,690,000
(N)	YUBA RIVER	10,000	10,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE	319,000	319,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE	1,077,000	1,077,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE	733,000	733,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR	1,060,000	1,060,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE	519,000	519,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE	159,000	159,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE	197,000	197,000
(N)	CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD	1,668,000	1,668,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE	79,000	79,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE	421,000	421,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE	300,000	300,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE	113,000	113,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER	118,000	118,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM	204,000	204,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE	348,000	348,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	21,096,000	21,096,000
(N)	IWW REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY	30,000	30,000
(N)	MISPILLION RIVER	325,000	325,000
(N)	MURDERKILL RIVER	335,000	335,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR	9,794,000	9,794,000
	DIST OF COLUMBIA		
(N)	POTOMAC & ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL)	470,000	470,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR	32,000	32,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	APALACHICOLA BAY	714,000	714,000
(N)	BLACKWATER RIVER	504,000	504,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	6,391,000	6,391,000
(FC)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	5,588,000	5,588,000
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR	3,145,000	3,145,000
(N)	CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL	1,439,000	1,768,000
(N)	EAST PASS CHANNEL	444,000	444,000
(N)	ESCAMBIA-CONECUH RIVERS	625,000	625,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR	2,125,000	2,125,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR	1,055,000	1,055,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO ANCLOTE RIVER	2,182,000	2,182,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI	3,778,000	3,778,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR	3,772,000	3,872,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	4,818,000	4,818,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY	1,960,000	1,960,000
(N)	OKLAWAHA RIVER	40,000	40,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR	1,360,000	1,360,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR	1,105,000	1,105,000
(N)	PENSACOLA HARBOR	667,000	667,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET	2,474,000	2,474,000
(N)	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	2,738,000	2,738,000
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET	1,115,000	1,115,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR	3,425,000	3,425,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE	4,561,000	4,561,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT RIVERS, GA, FL & AL	4,522,000	5,900,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT)	600,000	600,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR	4,253,000	4,253,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM, LAKE SIDNEY LANIER	5,959,000	5,959,000
(MP)	CARTERS LAKE	2,780,000	2,780,000
(MP)	CLARKS HILL LAKE, GA & SC	5,680,000	5,680,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	5,757,000	5,757,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, GA & SC	3,375,000	3,375,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR	7,574,000	7,574,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA	367,000	367,000
(MP)	WEST POINT LAKE, GA & AL	3,598,000	3,598,000
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, OAHU	61,000	61,000
(N)	NAWILIWILI HARBOR	1,725,000	1,725,000
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM	2,026,000	2,026,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM & RESERVOIR	7,005,000	7,005,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE	918,000	918,000
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER, IL & IN	467,000	467,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE	2,746,000	2,746,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR	3,505,000	3,505,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER	3,113,000	3,113,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS	119,000	119,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY	29,428,000	29,428,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION)	1,265,000	1,265,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION	1,314,000	1,314,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE	3,856,000	3,856,000
(N)	MISS RIV BTWN MISSOURI RIV & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI, & IA (MCD)	56,243,000	56,243,000
(N)	MISS RIV BTWN MO RIVER & MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD)	8,978,000	8,978,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER	---	150,000
(FC)	REND LAKE	2,690,000	2,690,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR	1,195,000	1,195,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE	366,000	366,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR	1,108,000	1,858,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR	55,000	55,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE	321,000	321,000
(FC)	CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE	365,000	365,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE	398,000	398,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR	10,070,000	10,070,000
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE	377,000	377,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE	346,000	346,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE	372,000	372,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE	346,000	346,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE	3,110,000	3,110,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA & NE	2,722,000	2,722,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA & NE	6,206,000	6,206,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE	1,212,000	1,212,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK	3,317,000	3,317,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE	3,585,000	3,585,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE	1,198,000	1,198,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE	702,000	702,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE	415,000	415,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE	560,000	560,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE	645,000	645,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE	581,000	581,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM & RESERVOIR	875,000	875,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE	1,670,000	1,670,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE	691,000	691,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE	1,187,000	1,187,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE	1,784,000	1,784,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE	713,000	713,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE	1,284,000	1,284,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE	1,088,000	1,088,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE	238,000	238,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE	2,990,000	2,990,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE	1,707,000	1,707,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM - LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	3,725,000	3,725,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE	1,140,000	1,140,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE	660,000	660,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE	786,000	786,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE	517,000	517,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE	737,000	737,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE	703,000	703,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE	535,000	535,000
(N)	GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY & TN	1,015,000	1,015,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE	893,000	893,000
(N)	HICKMAN HARBOR	445,000	445,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER	843,000	843,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE	900,000	900,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK	11,000	11,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE	486,000	486,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO	212,000	212,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE	2,322,000	2,322,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN & IL	35,103,000	35,103,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN, & IL	4,657,000	4,657,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE	456,000	456,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE	1,098,000	1,098,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	477,000	477,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND	3,132,000	3,132,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	ATCH RIVER & BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK	11,940,000	11,940,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY	722,000	722,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR	302,000	302,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE	10,000	10,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE	640,000	640,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE	86,000	86,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS	8,395,000	8,395,000
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU	1,425,000	1,425,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION	11,664,000	11,664,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL	1,620,000	1,620,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR	356,000	356,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT	227,000	227,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER	420,000	420,000
(N)	MISS RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE	2,252,000	2,252,000
(N)	MISS RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	33,225,000	39,655,000
(N)	MISS RIVER-GULF OUTLET	6,140,000	6,140,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	2,262,000	2,262,000
(N)	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	1,388,000	1,388,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE	136,000	136,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS	12,511,000	12,511,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	85,000	85,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	225,000	225,000
(FC)	BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD & WV	1,022,000	1,022,000
(N)	CHESTER RIVER	467,000	467,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE HARBOR	463,000	463,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV, MD & WV	64,000	64,000
(N)	FISHING CREEK	423,000	423,000
(N)	WANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK	733,000	733,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY	494,000	494,000
(N)	TRED AVON RIVER	1,165,000	1,165,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER	941,000	941,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM	305,000	305,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM	309,000	309,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE	308,000	308,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL	8,570,000	8,570,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREAS	166,000	166,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE	142,000	142,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE	302,000	302,000
(N)	GREEN HARBOR	191,000	191,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM	316,000	316,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM	356,000	356,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE	267,000	267,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN & ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	132,000	132,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE	308,000	308,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM	225,000	225,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE	345,000	345,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR	171,000	171,000
(N)	BOLLES HARBOR	55,000	55,000
(N)	CASEVILLE HARBOR	167,000	167,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR	157,000	157,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR	622,000	622,000
(N)	CLINTON RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	800,000	800,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER	7,397,000	7,397,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR & GRAND RIVER	684,000	684,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR	179,000	179,000
(N)	HARRISVILLE HARBOR	261,000	261,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR	811,000	811,000
(N)	INLAND ROUTE	21,000	21,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY	897,000	897,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY (DIKED DISPOSAL)	3,100,000	3,100,000
(N)	LELAND HARBOR	90,000	90,000
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR	347,000	347,000
(N)	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR	234,000	234,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR	1,360,000	1,360,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI (DIKED DISPOSAL)	110,000	110,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR	1,878,000	1,878,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR	463,000	463,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR	253,000	253,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR	212,000	212,000
(N)	PORT SANILAC	155,000	155,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER	1,115,000	1,115,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	6,840,000	6,840,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER	4,211,000	4,211,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER	25,000	25,000
(N)	ST. CLAIR RIVER	847,000	847,000
(N)	ST. JOSEPH HARBOR	899,000	899,000
(MP)	ST. MARYS RIVER	10,070,000	10,070,000
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR	225,000	225,000
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	BIG STONE LAKE AND WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	316,000	316,000
(N)	DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	5,471,000	5,471,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKE	483,000	483,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX RIVER, MN & SD	241,000	241,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER	444,000	444,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE	209,000	209,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RIVER	61,000	61,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER	1,824,000	1,824,000
(N)	ST CROIX RIVER MINNESOTA & WISCONSIN	154,000	154,000
(N)	WINONA COMMERCIAL HARBOR	20,000	20,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE	100,000	100,000
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR	1,352,000	1,352,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT	272,000	272,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR	3,193,000	3,193,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER	106,000	106,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE	1,056,000	1,056,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR	3,631,000	3,631,000
(FC)	PEARL RIVER BASIN, MS & LA	116,000	116,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR	311,000	311,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE	111,000	111,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, EAST FORK	340,000	340,000
(N)	WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS	500,000	500,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER	3,000	3,000
	MISSOURI		
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR	410,000	410,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM & RESERVOIR	3,648,000	3,648,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE	3,074,000	3,074,000
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	5,646,000	5,646,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES	254,000	254,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE	718,000	718,000
(FC)	MERAMEC PARK LAKE	599,000	599,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	10,594,000	10,594,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE	726,000	726,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE	2,121,000	2,121,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE	4,017,000	4,017,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE	169,000	169,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FORT PECK LAKE	1,817,000	1,817,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM (LAKE KOOCANUSA)	3,856,000	3,856,000
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,106,000	6,106,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE	1,053,000	1,053,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	---	200,000
	MISSOURI RIVER, KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY IA&NE	50,000	50,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES	421,000	421,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	526,000	526,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	292,000	292,000
(FC)	PINE & MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES	100,000	100,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM	299,000	299,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE	342,000	342,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM	564,000	564,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES	731,000	731,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE	391,000	391,000
(N)	RYE HARBOR	240,000	240,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE	408,000	408,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET	487,000	487,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET	122,000	122,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER BETWEEN PHILADELPHIA AND TRENTON, NJ & PA	4,660,000	4,660,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	3,290,000	3,290,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS	2,021,000	2,021,000
(N)	SALEM RIVER	718,000	718,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM	1,063,000	1,063,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE	1,273,000	1,273,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE	1,201,000	1,201,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM	141,000	141,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM	233,000	233,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM & LAKE	516,000	516,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM	242,000	242,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE	268,000	268,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM	157,000	157,000
(N)	BAY RIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS	1,935,000	1,935,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL & TONAWANDA HARBOR	2,257,000	2,257,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR	1,638,000	1,638,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE	277,000	277,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET	1,650,000	6,000,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER	5,282,000	5,282,000
(N)	JONES INLET	2,142,000	2,142,000
(N)	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	1,290,000	1,290,000
(FC)	MT. MORRIS LAKE	956,000	956,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY & VT	36,000	36,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY & NJ	2,732,000	2,732,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	2,845,000	2,845,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR	6,161,000	6,161,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	569,000	569,000
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR	817,000	817,000
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR	827,000	827,000
(N)	ROUNDOUT HARBOR	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	440,000	440,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE	232,000	232,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT)	4,029,000	4,029,000
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM & LAKE	771,000	771,000
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR	355,000	355,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL	250,000	250,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON	476,000	476,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET	527,000	527,000
(N)	CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT	224,000	224,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	1,046,000	1,046,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER	485,000	485,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY	5,688,000	5,688,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS	19,000	19,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR	4,260,000	4,260,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET	337,000	337,000
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS	337,000	337,000
(N)	SILVER LAKE HARBOR	519,000	519,000
(FC)	W. KERR SCOTT DAM & RESERVOIR	1,212,000	1,212,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR	4,815,000	4,815,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE	406,000	406,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA	9,451,000	9,451,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE AND DAM	79,000	79,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA & BALDHILL DAM	490,000	490,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE	326,000	326,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE	511,000	511,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR	562,000	562,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE	864,000	864,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE	556,000	556,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM	369,000	369,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR	5,359,000	5,359,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR	777,000	777,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE	382,000	382,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE	337,000	337,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE	262,000	262,000
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR	872,000	872,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR	862,000	862,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR	1,377,000	1,377,000
(FC)	MASSILLON	15,000	15,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM & RESERVOIR	491,000	491,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE	723,000	723,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES	4,313,000	4,313,000
(FC)	NEWARK	15,000	15,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH OF KOKOSING RIVER LAKE	153,000	153,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE	758,000	758,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE	15,000	15,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR	1,279,000	1,279,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR	4,599,000	4,599,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM	242,000	242,000
(FC)	WEST FORK MILL CREEK LAKE	258,000	258,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE	448,000	448,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE	79,000	79,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE	593,000	593,000
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE	1,558,000	1,558,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE	1,133,000	1,133,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE	449,000	449,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE	3,087,000	3,087,000
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE	2,461,000	2,461,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE	616,000	616,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE	340,000	340,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE	486,000	486,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE	1,095,000	1,095,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE	543,000	543,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE	1,332,000	1,332,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE	2,362,000	2,362,000
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE	1,240,000	1,240,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE	496,000	496,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES	7,000	7,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE	679,000	679,000
(MP)	ROBERT S. KERR LOCK, DAM & RESERVOIR	3,257,000	3,257,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE	548,000	548,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE	762,000	762,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE	2,571,000	2,571,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE	927,000	927,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK & DAM	2,622,000	2,622,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE	486,000	486,000
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE	679,000	679,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE	616,000	616,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM	13,128,000	13,128,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER	502,000	502,000
(N)	COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE RIVS BELOW VANCVR & PORT, OR & WA	10,351,000	10,351,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	7,816,000	7,816,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND THE DALLES, OR & WA	321,000	321,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS	131,000	131,000
(N)	COOS BAY	2,351,000	2,351,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER	279,000	279,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE	937,000	937,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE	870,000	870,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE	1,543,000	1,543,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE	618,000	618,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE	387,000	387,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE DAM & LAKE	1,271,000	1,271,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES	2,001,000	2,001,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE	567,000	567,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK & DAM, OR & WA	11,858,000	11,858,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE	2,475,000	2,475,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE	2,326,000	2,326,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK & DAM, LAKE WALLULA, OR & WA	11,349,000	11,549,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD	359,000	359,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER HARBOR AT GOLD BEACH	429,000	429,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER	399,000	399,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL	229,000	229,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER	826,000	826,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	70,000	70,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AND WILLAMETTE FALLS	512,000	512,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE	341,000	341,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR	1,326,000	1,326,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER	5,252,000	5,252,000
(FC)	ALVIN R. BUSH DAM	305,000	305,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE	125,000	125,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE	639,000	639,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE	1,211,000	1,211,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE	513,000	513,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE	828,000	828,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE	1,175,000	1,175,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE	335,000	335,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, PA, NJ & DE	20,146,000	20,146,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH, CLARION RIVER LAKE	560,000	560,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM	384,000	384,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM	508,000	508,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR	159,000	159,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN	7,000	7,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM & ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA & NY	763,000	763,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE	729,000	729,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE	545,000	545,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE	259,000	259,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY	7,000	7,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE	1,954,000	1,954,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER	3,227,000	3,227,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA & OH	1,370,000	1,370,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE	202,000	202,000
(FC)	TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES	1,351,000	1,351,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE	1,048,000	1,048,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE	514,000	514,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE	553,000	553,000
(FC)	YORK, INDIAN ROCK DAM	310,000	310,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,132,000	1,132,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT)	3,372,000	3,372,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR	5,745,000	5,745,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	4,125,000	4,125,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER	320,000	320,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR	2,314,000	2,314,000
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	228,000	228,000
(N)	MURRELLS INLET	725,000	725,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER	482,000	482,000
(N)	TOWN CREEK	340,000	340,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE	3,892,000	3,892,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE	140,000	140,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE	119,000	119,000
(MP)	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE	6,346,000	6,346,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	7,547,000	7,547,000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE	2,304,000	2,304,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK & DAM	2,922,000	2,922,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM & RESERVOIR	2,564,000	2,564,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN & KY	2,359,000	2,359,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(MP)	J. PERCY PRIEST DAM & RESERVOIR	1,845,000	1,845,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK & DAM	3,804,000	3,804,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN, AL, & KY	8,416,000	8,416,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR	603,000	603,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE	441,000	441,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL (AREA 8)	461,000	461,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE	743,000	743,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE	2,476,000	2,476,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE	1,080,000	1,080,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR	2,920,000	2,920,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	650,000	650,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE	1,155,000	1,155,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO ARANSAS PASS - GIWW	800,000	800,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA - GIWW	190,000	190,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	2,730,000	2,730,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX & OK	4,304,000	4,404,000
(N)	DOUBLE BAYOU	600,000	600,000
(FC)	FERRELIS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O' THE PINES	1,606,000	1,606,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR	4,480,000	4,480,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR & CHANNEL	1,640,000	1,640,000
(FC)	GRANGER LAKE	1,174,000	1,174,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE	1,523,000	1,523,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	13,127,000	13,127,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE	762,000	762,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL	11,790,000	11,790,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE	351,000	351,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP	135,000	135,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE	1,895,000	1,895,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM	1,893,000	1,893,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL	830,000	830,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE	855,000	855,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN	919,000	919,000
(FC)	O. C. FISHER DAM & LAKE	948,000	948,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE	801,000	801,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE	942,000	942,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE	136,000	136,000
(N)	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY	14,310,000	14,310,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM & RESERVOIR	2,872,000	2,872,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE	1,985,000	1,985,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM	1,035,000	1,035,000
(N)	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL	2,160,000	2,160,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM & B.A. STEINHAGEN LAKE	716,000	716,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE	1,431,000	1,431,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE	205,000	205,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE	1,850,000	1,850,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM & LAKE	1,563,000	1,563,000
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE	341,000	341,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE	248,000	248,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE	439,000	439,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE	337,000	337,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM	309,000	309,000
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	1,972,000	2,505,000
(N)	CAPE CHARLES CITY HARBOR	1,392,000	1,392,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET	836,000	836,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW	846,000	846,000
(N)	HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	190,000	190,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER	1,198,000	1,198,000
(MP)	JOHN H. KERR DAM & RESERVOIR, VA & NC	4,691,000	4,691,000
(FC)	JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM & RESERVOIR	562,000	562,000
(N)	LYNNHAVEN INLET,VA	614,000	614,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR	5,886,000	5,886,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	294,000	294,000
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND LAKE	467,000	467,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE	1,420,000	1,420,000
(N)	TANGIER CHANNEL	375,000	375,000
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL,VA	1,021,000	1,021,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA	1,659,000	1,659,000
(N)	YORK RIVER	720,000	720,000
	WASHINGTON		
(N)	ANACORTES HARBOR	103,000	103,000
(N)	BELLINGHAM HARBOR	411,000	411,000
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM	6,480,000	6,480,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	666,000	666,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & SAND ISLAND	444,000	444,000
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER	607,000	607,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR & CHEHALIS RIVER	4,537,000	4,537,000
(FC)	HOWARD A. HANSON RESERVOIR	734,000	734,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK & DAM	5,822,000	5,822,000
(N)	LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR)	299,000	299,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL	3,278,000	3,278,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK & DAM, LAKE BRYAN	4,707,000	5,297,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA & ID	6,906,000	6,906,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK & DAM	4,507,000	4,507,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE	340,000	340,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM	1,081,000	1,081,000
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR	114,000	114,000
(N)	PORT TOWNSEND	52,000	52,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND & ITS TRIBUTARY WATERS	627,000	627,000
(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER	694,000	694,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR	466,000	466,000
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER	100,000	100,000
(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL	206,000	206,000
(FC)	TACOMA - PUYALLUP RIVER	35,000	35,000
(N)	TACOMA HARBOR	26,000	26,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK & DAM, LAKE CELILO, WA & OR	7,099,000	7,099,000
(N)	WW CON PT TOWNSEND & OAK BAY	52,000	52,000
(FC)	WYNOOCHEE LAKE	1,405,000	1,405,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE	558,000	558,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE	677,000	677,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE	722,000	722,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE	709,000	709,000
(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR	250,000	250,000
(FC)	ELKINS	21,000	21,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER	6,735,000	6,735,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, WV, MD & PA	13,353,000	13,353,000
(FC)	R. D. BAILEY LAKE	884,000	884,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE	905,000	905,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE	1,093,000	1,093,000
(N)	TYGART RIVER LAKE	855,000	855,000
	WISCONSIN		
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER	477,000	477,000
(N)	FOX RIVER	930,000	930,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	9,030,000	9,030,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR	757,000	757,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR	848,000	848,000
(FC)	LAFARGE LAKE	46,000	46,000
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR	1,505,000	1,505,000
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR	4,786,000	4,786,000
(N)	RACINE HARBOR	40,000	40,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR	307,000	307,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL	1,109,000	1,109,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	4,170,000	4,770,000
	INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL LEVEES	1,219,000	1,219,000
	SCHEDULING FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	1,950,000	1,950,000
	MONITOR COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	1,200,000	1,200,000
	RIVER ICE MANAGEMENT	2,205,000	2,205,000
	REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH (REMR)	7,780,000	7,780,000
	PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION		
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS AND OBSTRUCTIONS	1,000,000	1,000,000
	PROTECTION, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
	GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS	52,937,000	52,937,000
	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	7,128,000	7,128,000
	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	2,204,000	2,204,000
	COMMERCIAL STATISTICS	3,022,000	3,022,000
	MOBILIZATION PLANNING:	13,500,000	6,750,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-9,621,000	-37,746,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,420,000,000	1,417,447,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC)	SPECIAL
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(PHASE I)	AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

From funds available, the Corps of Engineers shall cooperate with other Federal or State agencies, private organizations or individuals for recreational activities and the promotion of tourism in the Tennessee-Tombigbee area.

Sardis Lake, Oklahoma.—The Committee notes that contrary to the testimony of the Corps of Engineers concerning Sardis Lake, Oklahoma, this year, and despite the fact that $1,772,000 has been appropriated in the last three years for Operation and Maintenance at Sardis Lake, and despite the fact that Sardis Lake is a relatively new project, the Sardis Lake project shows serious signs of wear.

Accordingly, the Committee has approved the budget request of $548,000 for operation and maintenance activities at Sardis Lake, and directs the Corps of Engineers to increase its efforts to adequately maintain the Sardis Lake project. Specifically, the Corps is directed to repair the severely eroded swimming beach; clear the extensive brush which exits in Potato Hills Central and causes heavy tick populations; correct the erosion problem on the dam embankment; and, make the necessary road improvements in the Potato Hills Recreation Area.

Denison Dam—Lake Texoma, Texas and Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $4,404,000, an increase of $100,000 over the budget, for operation and maintenance of Texoma Lake. The additional funding is for design and construction of a secondary project office, a part of which shall be made available for a visitors information center, on the north side of Texoma Lake in Marshall County, Oklahoma. The Committee believes that such a secondary office is necessary for improved operation and maintenance activities at the lake. Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to extend the county road onto Corps property and construct a parking area at the end of the nearly-completed county road in the area known as Widowmore Creek, near Silo in western Bryan County.

Missouri National Recreational River, Nebraska and South Dakota.—The Committee notes that existing structures in the project area need continued operations and maintenance. The bill provides $200,000 for this purpose.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has added funds in the amount of $100,000 to the Jacksonville Harbor project to initiate master plan studies for water resource recreation development for Jacksonville in the vicinity of the proposed Metropolitan Park.

Columbia River Fish Passages Facilities.—The Committee is aware of and strongly supports the effort to ensure that adequate juvenile salmon and steelhead fish passage facilities exist, permitting passage around the Columbia River mainstream and Lower Snake River dams. The Committee urges continuation of the ongoing improvements to the existing fish passage facilities. Therefore, the Committee has provided $450,000 for design of expanded juvenile fish holding and barge loading facilities and $140,000 for design and construction of improved fish screens at the Little Goose Lock and Dam, Washington. The bill also includes $200,000 to complete planning and design of similar fish holding facilities at McNary Lock and Dam, Washington and Oregon.

Fisheries Habitats Study, North Carolina.—The Committee is aware of the Memorandum of Agreement dated October 25, 1985, between the Corps of Engineers and the National Marine Fisheries Service for a cooperative effort to investigate the practicability of a national program for restoring fisheries habitats. The Committee supports this effort and desires that the Corps consider the feasibility of conducting pilot studies for the inlets of North Carolina.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Virginia.—The Committee allowance of $2,505,000 for the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Virginia, includes an increase of $533,000 for the Dismal Swamp Canal.

Eufaula Lake, Oklahoma.—Within the $3,087,000 provided for operation and maintenance of Eufaula Lake project in Oklahoma, the Secretary of the Army is directed to construct flood prevention measures to the Pittsburg county road leading from Highway 31 near the Collins Development.

Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, DE & MD.—The Committee understands that, because of various dredging constraints, the controlling depth of the C&D Canal is considerably less than the authorized depth of 35 feet and is not adequate to meet the needs of waterborne commerce. The Committee believes that the best interests of the Nation require that this project meet those needs. When the study presently being accomplished by the Philadelphia District of the Corps of Engineers to seek ways to increase the controlling depth is completed, additional dredging requirements may be identified to correct this problem. The Committee directs the Corps to make every effort to complete any newly identified requirements within the funds provided for Fiscal Year 1987.

Fire Island Inlet, NY.—Fire Island Inlet, on the south shore of Long Island, New York, is a matter of concern to the Committee. Lack of maintenance to the existing jetty threatens to undo Federal, State, and local efforts to stabilize the shore. Erosion downdrift threatens to breach the barrier island and undermine the Shore Parkway. The inlet is essential to major portions of the economy of both Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Commercial trawlers and a major charter boat center are dependent on the inlet, as are almost a hundred marinas and boatyards. Additionally, over 250,000 paying passengers a year are moved through the now dangerous inlet. Stabilization of the shore is essential to the preservation of Robert Moses State Park, highways, and structures, as well as the maintenance of the salinity environment of Great South Bay. The bill includes $6 million for this vital project.

Inspection of Completed Works: Sacramento River Flood Control Project, California.—The Committee has included $600,000 for a comprehensive analysis of the long-term integrity of the flood control system for the Sacramento River and its tributaries in collaboration with the State of California. The Committee is aware that even before the recent flooding, regional flood control officials felt the need for a thorough survey of the system. While it did serve well in the floods and prevent billions of dollars in damages, under stress it validated concerns that in many places remedial work is necessary as soon as possible, as may be enhanced levels of protection. The Corps is directed to report back to the Committee on pro-

tection enhancement requirements which it encounters in its review of the project.

Taylorsville Lake, Kentucky.—The Committee notes that the State of Kentucky has provided their share of funding for recreation development at Taylorsville Lake, Kentucky. Within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to allocate $1,300,000 to meet the Federal share for recreation facilities.

Clarks Hill Lake, Georgia and South Carolina.—The Committee recognizes the increased demand on local law enforcement officers in Columbia County, Georgia, associated with the public use of Clarks Hill Lake. The Committee has been advised that there is a 100% increase in reported crimes, and that the demands far exceed local resources. Accordingly, the Committee directs that the Corps provide within existing funds for such purposes those additional sums that, in the judgment of the Secretary, are necessary to provide reasonable law protection.

REVOLVING FUND

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$6,699,000
Budget estimate, 1987	12,000,000
Recommended, 1987	12,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+5,301,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The bill includes $10 million for construction of a dustpan dredge replacement and $2 million for automatic data processing equipment and software conversion under the Corps of Engineers Automation Plan.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$102,399,000
Budget estimate, 1987	115,000,000
Recommended, 1987	115,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+12,601,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

Overseas Travel by Corps of Engineers Personnel.—The Committee is deeply concerned about the expenditures that have occurred in recent years in overseas travel by Corps personnel. The Committee has noted a nearly 100 percent increase in foreign travel expenditures by the Corps from fiscal years 1983 to 1985, jumping from $349,120 in fiscal year 1983 to $439,922 in fiscal year 1984 and increasing to $617,573 in fiscal year 1985. If those travel costs are eliminated from consideration for which the Corps receives reimbursement from other Federal agencies or governments, the remaining foreign travel costs are $276,662 for fiscal year 1983, $410,826 for fiscal year 1984, and $513,437 for fiscal year 1985, which is still nearly a 100 percent increase in two years.

The Committee finds this level of foreign travel to be in direct conflict with cost reduction efforts that have been mandated agencywide by the Congress and the Administration. In addition, the Committee is concerned that the reports provided by the Corps to the Committee on this matter appear to indicate that Corps policy holds field personnel to a more rigid standard for reporting re-

quirements on foreign travel than it does headquarters personnel. While individual trips were reported for field personnel, one lump sum was reported for headquarters personnel, indicating that $38,219 was spent in fiscal year 1985 on 250 days of travel for 32 people. The only justification provided for this travel was that it was for "meetings, inspections, and site visits" for the headquarters staff.

Accordingly, the Corps is directed to provide a report to the Committee including country visited, date of trip, trip length, number of people on the trip, total Corps cost, reimbursed cost (if any), and purpose of the visit for each individual foreign trip by headquarters personnel for fiscal years 1983, 1984 and 1985 funded by Corps civil works appropriations. The Committee expects the justification for each trip to be explained in a detailed and clear manner.

In addition, the Corps is directed to provide a similar report for all foreign travel by Corps employees during fiscal year 1986 by December 31, 1986, and a report of fiscal year 1987 foreign travel by December 31, 1987.

No funds are included in the bill for cooperative efforts with foreign governments pertaining to river and harbor, and flood control improvements.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$32,571,000
Budget estimate, 1987	27,820,000
Recommended; 1986	32,320,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−251,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+4,500,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance shown on the following table:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
ARIZONA			
SPRING CANYON PUMPED STORAGE PROJECT	750,000	270,000	1,200,000
PIMA COUNTY/SANTA CRUZ RIVER GROUNDWATER	600,000	100,000	100,000
CALIFORNIA			
ALL AMERICAN CANAL RELOCATION	930,000	630,000	630,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:			
DELTA DIVISION, KELLOGG UNIT REFORMULATION	548,000	---	200,000
DELTA SUPPORT STUDIES	2,934,000	283,000	283,000
DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	---	---	400,000
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT CANAL LINING AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	486,000	72,000	72,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE	900,000	350,000	350,000
REFUGE WATER SUPPLY	250,000	170,000	170,000
SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY GROUNDWATER	500,000	150,000	150,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE STUDY, CVP	1,200,000	---	500,000
COLORADO			
CRSPIP, LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT	1,563,000	100,000	100,000
HIGH MOUNTAIN AQUIFER STUDY	620,000	230,000	230,000
MESA-DELTA M&I GROUNDWATER STUDY	1,083,000	180,000	180,000
SOUTH PLATTE RIVER OPERATIONS STUDY	315,000	115,000	115,000
PROGRAM RELATED ENGINEERING AND SCIENTIFIC STUDIES	155,823,000	4,870,000	4,870,000
IDAHO			
OAKLEY FAN GROUNDWATER & RECHARGE INVESTIGATION	350,000	150,000	150,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT,NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION EXTEN	760,000	160,000	160,000
KANSAS			
KANSAS RIVER BASIN WATER OPERATIONS STUDY	540,000	180,000	180,000
MONTANA			
MILK RIVER WATER SUPPLY UNIT (P-SMBP) (FORMERLY MARIAS-MILK UNIT (P-SMBP)	826,000	140,000	140,000
NEBRASKA			
LOUP BASIN STUDY	100,000	---	100,000
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT (P-SMBP)	1,655,000	401,000	701,000
SOUTH PLATTE-FRENCHMAN PROJECT	500,000	---	100,000
NEVADA			
DEEP-CARBONATE AQUIFER	2,989,000	764,000	764,000
NEW MEXICO			
ALAMOGORDO M&I WATER SUPPLY STUDY	710,000	150,000	150,000
SAN MIGUEL ACEQUIAS ON TH PECOS RIVER	---	---	50,000
OKLAHOMA			
EAST CENTRAL OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	536,500	---	500,000
KIAMICHI HYDROPOWER STUDY	497,000	---	500,000
NORTHWEST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	962,000	170,000	170,000
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	1,241,000	230,000	230,000
OREGON			
DESCHUTES RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	290,000	50,000	50,000
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT	580,000	134,000	134,000
NO. DOUGLAS CO. COOP. WTR RES STUDY (FORMERLY UMPQUA RIVER BASIN WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT INVEST.)	500,000	215,000	215,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
CENTRAL SOUTH DAKOTA WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM (CENDAK)	1,975,000	200,000	750,000
TEXAS			
TEXAS BASIN, BEDIAS PROJECT	5,388,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
TEXAS BASIN, SAN JACINTO PROJECT	869,000	120,000	120,000
UTAH			
CRSP POWER PEAKING CAPACITY	876,000	300,000	300,000
CRSPIP, DIRTY DEVIL RIVER UNIT	950,000	165,000	165,000
WASATCH FRONT TOTAL WATER MANAGEMENT	1,364,000	90,000	90,000
WASHINGTON			
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	2,125,000	100,000	100,000
WYOMING			
SEMINOE DAM MODIFICATION	260,000	70,000	70,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
VARIOUS			
UPPER SNAKE RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT	230,000	200,000	200,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	58,118,000	3,620,000	3,620,000
GENERAL ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH:			
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	215,756,000	4,800,000	6,400,000
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS:			
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORD. ACTIVITIES	8,142,000	4,330,000	4,330,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	3,049,000	400,000	400,000
INVESTIGATIONS OF EXISTING PROJECTS	754,000	555,000	555,000
MINOR WORK IN CONNECTION WITH COMPLETED PROJ. INVEST.	1,220,000	620,000	620,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	3,017,000	1,565,000	1,565,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	-1,179,000	-2,409,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		27,820,000	32,320,000

Delta Water Management Program, California.—The Committee has included $400,000 for the Delta Water Management Program, to allow the Bureau to participate with the Corps of Engineers, and State and local agencies in the important ongoing collaborative programs in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

East Central Oklahoma Water Supply Study, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the continuation of the East Central Oklahoma Water Supply Study. The Committee strongly supports this study and recognizes the Bureau of Reclamation would be wasting the large investment already made through previous appropriations made for the study if it were now discontinued. Therefore, the Committee, knowing that the study is nearing completion, directs the Bureau to expedite completion of the study.

Kiamichi Hydropower Study, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the continuation of the Kiamichi Hydropower Study in Oklahoma. The Committee strongly supports this study and recognizes the Bureau of Reclamation would be wasting the large investment that has already been made in it through previous appropriations if it was now discontinued. Therefore, the Committee directs the Bureau to complete the study in fiscal year 1987, as originally scheduled.

Northwest Oklahoma Water Supply Study.—The Committee has approved the budget request of $170,000 for the Northwest Oklahoma Water Study; however, the Bureau is directed to provide the Committee report by December 31, 1986, on the status, potential, and feasibility of this project.

Prairie Bend Project, Nebraska, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 to the budget estimate of $401,000 for the Prairie Bend feasibility study for fiscal year 1987, for a total of $701,000. These funds are to be used for the continuation and development of such studies as are necessary to determine and maintain adequate instream flows required for the many uses of the Platte River; including providing safe and reliable water supplies, protection of wildlife habitat, and irrigation. Such studies should include verification of the instream models being developed, development of species models for wildlife dependent upon the Platte, development of daily or suitable instream flow models for the North, South, and mainstream Platte River and a sediment loading model. It is the Committee's intention that the Fish and Wildlife Service be fully involved in this work and that adequate funds be made available to the fish and Wildlife Service from this appropriation. Further, the Committee recognizes that there is a need to coordinate this study with the Platte River Joint Management Study and directs the Department to do so. Finally, the Committee believes it would be premature to issue a draft environmental impact statement before these studies are completed and can be incorporated into the plan and planning process.

Loup River Basin, Nebraska.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to continue and expand its efforts to complete a four-year study of the Loup River Basin, Nebraska, at a total cost of $1,500,000, the Federal share of which would be 50% or $775,000. This bill includes $100,000 to continue funding begun in fiscal year 1986.

South Platte-Frenchmen Project, Nebraska and Colorado.—The Committee notes with continuing concern the declining water supply situation in the Frenchman-Cambridge Division, Nebraska, and directs the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate a four-year study of groundwater recharge applications and of supplemental water supplies for the Enders Reservoir, at an estimated cost of $1 million. This bill provides $100,000 for the Federal 50% share of the first phase. Local sponsors have committed themselves to provide the non-Federal share.

Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Program.—The Committee continues to be concerned about the subsidence of ground surface in areas of Arizona and about the need to conserve water in the State. It is also aware of the successful multi-purpose Indian Bend Wash Project. To help alleviate subsidence problems, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with the U.S. Corps of Engineers as builders of the Indian Bend Wash Project, to include the Scottsdale, Maricopa County, Arizona, area as part of its evaluation under Phase I provisions of the Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Program authorized by Public Law 98-434, and that funds be made available for such evaluation from the General Investigations account.

Atmospheric Water Resources Management Program.—The bill includes $600,000 for the Southwest Cooperative Operational Demonstration Program-Southwest Drought Rain Augmentation Research and $1,000,000 for the Sierra cooperative pilot studies of the effects of cloud seeding.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriation adjusted 1986	$499,267,000
Budget estimate, 1987	576,759,000
Recommended, 1987	592,359,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation 1986	+93,092,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+15,600,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			
ARIZONA			
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (BIA)	51,900,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
CALIFORNIA			
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:			
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	353,206,000	1,060,000	1,060,000
SAN LUIS UNIT	1,261,980,000	12,172,000	12,172,000
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,093,948,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	609,270,000	372,000	372,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM	306,020,000	4,650,000	4,650,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	342,410,000	10,642,000	10,642,000
SPRING CREEK TOXICITY PROGRAM, CVP	700,000	350,000	350,000
LOWER COLORADO RIVER WATER SUPPLY	1,657,000	---	100,000
COLORADO			
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II,CRBSCP	243,043,000	12,055,000	12,055,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	84,072,000	12,282,000	12,282,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION	77,292,000	12,594,000	12,594,000
NEBRASKA			
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP	350,910,000	14,035,000	14,035,000
O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP	173,424,000	1,381,000	1,381,000
NEVADA			
LAS VEGAS WASH UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	129,799,000	75,000	75,000
NEW MEXICO			
BRANTLEY PROJECT	128,640,000	23,650,000	23,650,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	1,402,193,000	18,000,000	33,000,000
OKLAHOMA			
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	105,635,000	7,755,000	7,755,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	48,415,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	85,741,000	21,480,000	21,480,000
WASHINGTON			
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT	78,000,000	1,725,000	1,725,000
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:			
IRRIGATION FACILITIES	3,204,576,000	7,110,000	7,110,000
THIRD POWERPLANT	761,250,000	23,890,000	23,890,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE & PROTECTIVE FACILITIES	28,615,000	12,050,000	12,050,000
WYOMING			
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	66,235,000	13,400,000	13,400,000
VARIOUS			
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT	35,457,000	5,760,000	5,760,000
COLORADO RIVER BRIDGE CROSSING	74,500,000	500,000	500,000
MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP	464,763,000	26,427,000	26,427,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:			
ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	3,560,000	310,000	310,000
BOISE PROJECT, ARROWROCK DIVISION, IDAHO	6,870,000	1,490,000	1,490,000
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO	31,040,000	1,289,000	1,289,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK&LEVEE SYSTEM,AR.,CO.,NV	158,612,000	15,885,000	15,885,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACTIVITIES	3,393,000	507,000	507,000
FRYINGPAN ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO	494,500,000	5,513,000	5,513,000
GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA-CALIFORNIA	78,115,000	845,000	845,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA	51,533,000	1,889,000	1,889,000
LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, COLORADO	7,346,000	375,000	375,000
MISCELLANEOUS ENGINEERING SERVICES, COLORADO	433,000	10,000	10,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	42,639,000	150,000	150,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA	26,146,000	1,134,000	1,134,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS	97,555,000	1,420,000	1,420,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS	73,146,000	150,000	150,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
UNITS OR DIVISIONS, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:			
AINSWORTH UNIT, NEBRASKA	25,683,000	600,000	600,000
CANYON FERRY UNIT, MONTANA	17,607,000	522,000	522,000
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA	24,230,000	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	42,829,000	180,000	180,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA	490,000,000	65,000	65,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	7,010,000	5,000	5,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, NEW MEXICO	17,526,000	2,280,000	2,280,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	356,455,000	205,000	205,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	98,053,000	385,000	385,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION		35,259,000	35,259,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:			
COOLIDGE DAM, ARIZONA	---	---	500,000
CACHUMA PROJECT, BRADBURY DAM, CALIFORNIA	5,000,000	90,000	90,000
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT, COLORADO	2,031,000	207,000	207,000
HEART BUTTE UNIT, HEART BUTTE DAM,N.DAKOTA(P-SMBP)	4,500,000	2,540,000	2,540,000
LEWISTON ORCHARDS, SOLDIERS MEADOW, IDAHO	935,000	335,000	335,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, IDAHO-WYOMING	82,000,000	14,770,000	14,770,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, LAKE TAHOE DAM, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	610,000	180,000	180,000
NEWTON PROJECT, NEWTON DAM, UTAH	3,043,000	2,543,000	2,543,000
RAPID VALLEY UNIT,PACTOLA DAM,SOUTH DAKOTA(P-SMBP)	9,405,000	1,463,000	1,463,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA	44,201,000	2,291,000	2,291,000
SAN LUIS UNIT, LITTLE PANOCHE DAM, CALIFORNIA (CVP)	383,000	40,000	40,000
SAN LUIS UNIT, LOS BANOS DAM, CALIFORNIA (CVP)	360,000	40,000	40,000
SAN LUIS UNIT, O'NEILL DAM, CALIFORNIA (CVP)	1,350,000	60,000	60,000
SEEDSKADEE, FONTENELLE DAM, CRSP, WYOMING	52,000,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CASITAS DAM, CALIFORNIA	3,000,000	90,000	90,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA	2,700,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	4,625,000	450,000	450,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY	56,916,000	5,859,000	5,859,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS		38,458,000	38,958,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:			
OKANOGAN PROJECT, OKANOGAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA	9,936,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, HEART MOUNTAIN DIVISION, WYOMING	5,500,000	750,000	750,000
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT, UTAH	7,651,000	853,000	853,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, FT. SHAW DIVISION, MONTANA	1,400,000	380,000	380,000
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, COLORADO	5,640,000	664,000	664,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT		3,647,000	3,647,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS		332,479,000	348,079,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND			
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS			
COLORADO			
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	314,600,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT	116,527,000	4,286,000	4,286,000
DOLORES PROJECT	404,524,000	20,375,000	20,375,000
UTAH			
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	1,589,240,000	83,793,000	83,793,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT	155,284,000	100,000	100,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UPALCO UNIT	123,504,000	50,000	50,000
VARIOUS			
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:			
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:			
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT	76,213,000	303,000	303,000
UNITS:			
MODIFICATIONS & ADDITIONS TO COMPLETED FACILITIES	24,063,000	1,022,000	1,022,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:			
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	177,242,000	8,747,000	8,747,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES	182,764,000	4,018,000	4,018,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT		123,694,000	123,694,000

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

ARIZONA

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS....	274,468,000	57,174,000	57,174,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF).....	3,170,732,000	145,596,000	145,596,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA - SAFETY OF DAMS.....	226,000,000	1,147,000	1,147,000
VARIOUS			
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	-83,331,000	-83,331,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.....		576,759,000	592,359,000

Auburn Dam, California.—The Committee has continued to provide funds for the Auburn Dam-Folsom South project since the Department determined in 1980 that a seismically safe concrete gravity dam could be constructed. While recent flooding in California resulted in no out-of-channel damage to the American River watershed which would be controlled by an Auburn Dam, the events nonetheless underscored the necessity of deciding whether there will be an Auburn Dam and if so, what its design will be. Flood control, until now only a secondary benefit of Auburn Dam as conceived, must be considered an imperative if not the primary objective for future planning in the watershed. The Committee directs the Bureau to work with the Corps of Engineers to undertake studies as referenced elsewhere in this Report into alternate means of flood control in lieu of the traditional Auburn. The Committee feels it essential that an alternative means of protection be implemented as soon as possible if the traditional Auburn is not to provide it.

With respect to the current Bureau investigations into Auburn Dam, the Committee urges the Bureau to submit proposed authorization legislation for a project by the time of its budget submission for FY 1988. The Committee directs that the Bureau also report to the Congress on an anticipated time line for Congressional consideration of such legislation and subsequent funding requirements for construction of project facilities. If the Bureau is unable to propose legislation, the report should describe precisely the progress of the investigations and state when the Bureau does anticipate being able to propose legislation.

If no legislation or explanation is forthcoming, the conclusion now appears unavoidable that an economically viable Auburn-Folsom South project as traditionally conceived will not obtain necessary support and therefore will not be developed. Accordingly, it is the Committee's current intent to discontinue funding for continued investigations on the project in FY 1988 and thereafter unless authorization legislation proposed for a specific project is fully supported by the Administration and is under active consideration by the Congress. Meanwhile, development of flood control alternatives to the traditional Auburn project will continue on an expedited basis as directed above.

McGee Creek, Oklahoma.—The Committee has approved the budget request of $7,755,000 for construction of the McGee Creek project. The Committee directs the Bureau to complete construction of the East Side and West Side Access Roads in fiscal year 1987.

Arbuckle Project, Oklahoma (Sulphur Pipeline).—The Committee has approved the budget request of $310,000 for the Arbuckle Project, and directs the Bureau to proceed with completion of the design work on the Sulphur, Oklahoma, pipeline under the expectation that the necessary repayment agreement will be signed by the City of Sulphur.

North Loup Division, Nebraska.—The construction of the North Loup Division, Nebraska, is now more than half complete, but the Bureau of Reclamation has notified the Committee formally that significant progress in construction cannot continue beyond fiscal year 1987 without authorizing additional appropriations. The Committee provides additional authority to permit construction to pro-

61-313 O - 86 - 3

ceed on schedule while the authorizing committee considers legislation to provide the appropriations ceiling necessary for completion of the project.

Safety of Dams—Theodore Roosevelt Dam, Arizona.—Last year, recognizing the need to correct safety deficiencies at dams on the Salt River in Arizona, The Congress directed the Secretary of the Interior to proceed as expeditiously as possible in making necessary modifications to the dams, pursuant to the Federal Reclamation Safety of Dams Act, Public Law 95-578, as amended. In order to accelerate such work on the Theodore Roosevelt Dam, being funded as a part of the Central Arizona Project, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to make available up to $3,100,000 in fiscal year 1987 from existing funds. The additional money is to supplement the $1,100,000 for this project included in the Administration's budget request.

Safety of Dams—Coolidge Dam, Arizona.—Long-term safety modifications are needed at Coolidge Dam in Arizona. While realizing that the dam is the responsibility of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Committee also understands that the Bureau of Reclamation is responsible for coordinating all dam safety issues in the Department of the Interior and that the Bureau has been assisting the BIA by collecting data and performing preliminary design work to determine the nature and extent of actions needed to correct the problems at Coolidge Dam. Therefore, the Committee is providing an additional $500,000 to allow the Bureau to continue these activities.

Grass Valley Creek Debris Dam, California.—The Committee provided $500,000 in fiscal year 1986 for work on this dam. The Committee continues to be concerned about the need to restore the fishery in the Trinity River System and understands construction of an access road to the dam site must be initiated early in fiscal year 1987. The Committee recommends construction of the access road be initiated as soon as possible within existing funds to avoid any unnecessary delays.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$126,960,000
Budget estimate, 1987	150,000,000
Recommended, 1987	140,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+13,040,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−10,000,000

In 1987, a total of 34 projects, project areas, or divisions of projects will be operated and maintained for power, municipal and industrial water supplies, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits with funds made available under this appropriation.

Provision is also made for administration of water marketing contracts on Corps of Engineers projects, examination of existing structures, and administration of the provisions of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 1261).

The Committee allowance includes a general reduction of $10 million.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$37,624,000
Budget estimate, 1987	38,021,000
Recommended, 1987	40,651,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+3,027,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+2,630,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown in the following table:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
LOAN PROGRAM			
ARIZONA			
AK-CHIN FARMS EAST	12,241,000	---	2,000,000
AK-CHIN FARMS PROJECT-PHASE 2	13,588,000	5,188,000	5,188,000
GILA RIVER FARMS SUPPLEMENTAL	6,683,000	1,537,000	1,537,000
CALIFORNIA			
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	25,390,000	1,070,000	1,700,000
ELSINORE VALLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT	25,975,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
OAKDALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	17,774,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT (ESCALATION)	18,591,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT	20,286,000	100,000	100,000
SAN BENITO COUNTY WATER CONS. & FLOOD DISTRICT	19,716,000	365,000	365,000
SANTA ANA WATERSHED PROJECT AUTHORITY	14,714,000	8,714,000	8,714,000
COLORADO			
AMITY MUTUAL IRRIGATION COMPANY	4,223,000	2,541,000	2,541,000
MONTANA			
EAST BENCH GRAVITY COMPANY	3,193,000	1,175,000	1,175,000
TEXAS			
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO.1, SUPPL	12,972,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTICT NO.2 (SAN JUAN)	16,100,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
DELTA LAKE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	10,982,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
WASHINGTON			
GREATER WENATCHEE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	6,562,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
VARIOUS			
CONSTRUCTION COST INCREASES	11,322,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
ADMINISTRATION OF LOAN PROGRAM	13,339,000	840,000	840,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	-2,809,000	-2,809,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM		38,021,000	40,651,000

LOAN PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	($46,237,000)
Budget estimate, 1987	(43,806,000)
Recommended, 1987	(42,000,000)
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	(−4,237,000)
Budget estimate, 1987	(−1,806,000)

The limitation provides a control over the principal amount of loans that may be made under the Loan Program in FY 1987.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$47,084,000
Budget estimate, 1987	51,200,000
Recommended, 1987	51,200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+4,116,0000
Budget estimate, 1987	

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the reclamation program as performed by the Commissioner's office, the Denver Engineering and Research Center and other offices in the six regions.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$957,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,000,000
Recommended, 1987	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+43,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

This fund is used to assure continuous operation of all projects and project facilities governed by the Federal Reclamation Law in the event of drought, canal bank failures, electrical system failures, municipal and industrial water delivery system failures, or other emergencies. Because of excessively high emergency requirements resulting from the California floods in FY 1986, it is expected that all prior year emergency funds will be committed.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	
Budget estimate, 1987	$6,400,000
Recommended, 1987	6,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+6,400,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The Working Capital Fund (WCF) was established in December 1985 pursuant to authorizing language included in the Fiscal Year 1986 Appropriation Act. Ongoing activities in support of all Bureau programs and projects and for other agencies will be brought under the WCF. The fund will provide a more efficient and equitable means of financing services, supplies and equipment provided to beneficiaries. Initial WCF activities include centralized computer services, the Bureau's core sampling and drilling program, and de-

velopment and maintenance of construction/engineering training modules.

The WCF is intended to operate within its own resources, through charges to beneficiaries for reimbursement of direct costs. The fund will also enable the Bureau to accumulate funds for replacement of assets from charges for depreciation. In the early years, acquisition of new assets or replacement of obsolete ones may require appropriations because depreciation charges were not accumulated on existing assets in the past. In fiscal year 1987, $6.4 million is required to continue acquisition of a Computer Aided Design and Drafting System (CADDS) to be used Bureauwide, bringing state-of-the-art technology to the engineering and design functions.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in Title III provide for the Department of Energy programs relating to Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities; Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities; General Science and Research Activities; Atomic Energy Defense Activities; Departmental Administration; Power Marketing Activities; Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the Geothermal Resources Development Fund.

APPROPRIATION LANGUAGE CHANGES

The budget submission for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Energy proposes a number of changes to the appropriation language in the fiscal year 1986 Appropriation Act. The Committee has reviewed these proposed changes and finds some of them unnecessary. The fiscal year 1987 bill retains portions of the language used in prior years because the Committee was presented with no reason to agree to the proposed language.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION MATERIAL

The Department of Energy prepares and submits to the Committees on Appropriation of the House and Senate, justification material intended to describe and explain the program performance, accomplishments, objectives and requirements for funding of the various programs, projects and activities of the Department. This material is submitted for the use of the Committees primarily but serves also to identify and explain the Department's activities to the Congress and the general public.

During the past five years most programs in the Energy Department have been reduced in real dollars. However, the amount of material used to explain or justify these programs and their funding requirements has increased. At the same time, the material presented has become more obtuse, general and meaningless for the purpose of *justifying* the budget requirements.

The GAO, in a recent review of DOE's accelerator programs, was critical of the Department's justifications, and said that DOE's budget does not disclose technical uncertainties, preconstruction costs and total project costs. The Committee's investigative staff found much the same was true in a review it did concerning major facilities construction projects. The Department should take these recommendations into consideration in developing its revised justification format.

For these reasons, the Department is to prepare for the use of the Appropriations Committees greatly streamlined, shortened and improved justification material. Without desiring to be overly specific or limiting, the Department should seek to reduce the number of pages of justification material to less than 1,000 (down from the

present 2,282 pages accompanying the FY 1987 budget request); the material provided should highlight all changes and new activities, termination, cancellation or reductions in ongoing programs and should explain, briefly and in layman's terms, the objectives of each program activity for which funding is requested. The justification material should rely on tabular presentation of information and shall identify where the activities to be funded are to be conducted. Tabular information should be in sufficient detail to provide a realistic evaluation of the proposed programs and shall include a presentation of the percentage change for each line item included and for the totals for each program activity.

The Committee directs the Department's Budget Office to work closely with the Committee staff during the coming months to design improved justification formats.

GEOSCIENCES

Recent declines in energy prices have led to reductions in hydrocarbon geosciences studies. The Committee is concerned with this development and directs the Department to report by February 1, 1987, on a program of research in geosciences related to the discovery and recovery of domestic and recovery of domestic oil and gas resources. Such a program could advance technological capability in hydrocarban exploration and production technologies, particularly if it funds research at universities and leading research institutions in the field. The Committee expects the Department to coordinate this study with the ongoing activities of the Energy Research and Advisory Board's subpanel on Solid Earth Sciences.

Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$1,696,298,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,254,162,000
Recommended, 1987	1,316,326,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−379,972,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+62,164,000

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	1,479,043,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,062,807,000
Recommended, 1987	1,064,696,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−414,347,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+1,889,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	217,255,000
Budget estimate, 1987	191,355,000
Recommended, 1987	251,630,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+34,375,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+60,275,000

The appropriations recommended for Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities provide for all of the Department of Energy's renewable energy programs, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems and energy storage, environmental and

basic energy sciences programs. These programs address the development of longer-term energy supply options to provide the energy resources needed for sustained national growth and to alleviate our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign oil.

The tables accompanying the text of this report restore funds for FY 1986 projects deferred by the Administration and subsequently recommended to be overturned in the Urgent Supplemental Appropriation Act for FY 1986, now pending before the Congress. In any case, funds deferred for one fiscal year may not be deferred a second year and the Committee intends that those funds be made available for obligation to those projects for which originally appropriated. The proposed application of those funds to offset general Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities funding requirements has been changed to indicate they have been restored to the individual programs.

SOLAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Fiscal year 1986 appropriation	$144,624,000
Fiscal year 1987 estimate	72,292,000
Fiscal year 1987 recommendation	113,395,000
Change from estimate	+41,103,000

The solar and renewable energy programs of the Department of Energy include passive and active solar, photovoltaic energy systems, solar thermal energy systems, biomass, wind, alcohol, ocean energy, solar international, information and program direction and support activities.

The budget request for fiscal year 1987 solar energy programs is $72,292,000, a reduction of $31,229,000 from the fiscal year 1986 level.

Solar Buildings Energy Systems.—The recommendation of $4,700,000 includes $600,000 for the continued development of the compound parabolic concentrator (CPC) solar collector technology.

Photovoltaic Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation provides $35,600,000 for the photovoltaic energy systems program. This includes an additional $7,500,000 for the photovoltaics for Utility Scale Applications (PVUSA) project. This shall be considered a model for examining the possibility of further application of the proposed cooperative research with private sector participation effort and is the only funding approved for this purpose. The proposal submitted to the DOE by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company is necessary to develop potential combinations of photovoltaic technologies and systems and encourage their evolution toward utility scale application. Because the proposal does not entail use of technologies in an actual commercial context, because it would be so heavily cost shared by the private sector and because it is neutral not only between manufacturers but between systems and technologies, the proposal fits well the Administration's ideas on cooperative research with the private sector.

The Committee recommends the addition of a semiconductor device design and development component to the present thin-film materials research program. Semiconductor device designs, similar to those used by the microelectronics industry, would be tolerant of faults in the photovoltaic materials and accordingly would not re-

quire perfect materials. It is anticipated that this fault-tolerant approach can be applied to improving the performance of polycrystalline thin-films of silicon and gallium arsenide, GaAs. Thin-film polycrystalline silicon and thin films of polycrystalline GaAs should be examined for new device designs. An additional $1,500,000 is added for this activity.

The Committee recommendation provides an additional $5,000,000 for ongoing research in materials, collectors, systems research and innovative concepts.

Solar Thermal Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation provides $23,000,000 for solar thermal energy systems to maintain the capability to support the continuation of solar thermal research, both in Department of Energy laboratories and in the private sector. These funds are to be applied to collection technology, energy conversion technology and systems and application technology.

Biofuels Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation provides $20,200,000 for biofuels energy research to provide for production research, short rotation intensive culture and other activities. The recommendation includes $500,000 to continue the Hawaii Biofuels Program at the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute, the same as was provided in FY 1986. The recommendation includes $1,350,000 for a 50/50 cost-shared project with the Gas Research Institute to biologically convert organic matter to methane at an existing experimental test unit.

Wind Energy Research.—The Committee recommendation includes $16,750,000 for wind energy research, to be allocated as follows: completion of MOD–5B large-scale wind turbine, $4,500,000; atmospheric fluid dynamics, $1,000,000; Aerodynamics, $4,000,000; Structural dynamics, $1,000,000; Advanced component research, $1,000,000; Supporting research, $3,350,000; University research, $1,000,000; and funds for capital equipment. From the total funds available for wind energy research, $800,000 is to be made available for the Renewable Energy Research Center program at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Ocean Energy Systems.—The recommendation provides $4,500,000 for ocean energy systems. Of the amount provided, not less then $2,000,000 is be to expended to continue work on the PICHTR–OTEC project. The PICHTR project is an internationally sponsored open-cycle OTEC project which will serve as the centerpiece of the Department's oceans program for years to come. The project has attracted sponsors from other nations, and the amount provided for this program in FY 1987 is necessary to satisfy our international obligation to provide the U.S. contribution for the PICHTR–OTEC project.

Other Solar Energy Activities.—The Committee recommendation provides $8,645,000 for other solar programs. Maintenance of a balanced and reasonable solar research program requires that a reasonably constant staffing level be provided for. Consequently, the Committee recommendation provides $4,100,000, the same as requested. A total of $500,000 is recommended for solar international activities. Program support funding is required for essential analyses and studies and $500,000 is recommended for this. Technology transfer is recommended to be funded at $2,500,000. The Depart-

ment should make every effort to assure that the results of research conducted by the Department is clear, concise and usable to the community of users.

In FY 1985, the Committee made funds available to conduct a technology assessment which evaluates the potential of producing hydrogen as a renewable fuel and identifies the research needed to accomplish this objective. The technology assessment has concluded that hydrogen may become the fuel of choice to satisfy a wide variety of the world's energy needs.

The Committee has provided $1,200,000 to allow the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute and the Florida Solar Energy Center to conduct research on the hydrogen technologies identified in the final report of the technology assessment. Priority is to be given to hydrogen production from renewable energy, photo conversion, and international research on hydrogen utilization.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
SOLAR ENERGY			
I. Solar applications			
A. Solar building energy systems			
Operating expenses	7,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
Capital equipment	481,000	---	---
Subtotal, Solar building energy systems	8,181,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems			
Operating expenses	39,523,000	19,600,000	34,600,000
Capital equipment	1,155,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	40,678,000	20,600,000	35,600,000
C. Solar thermal energy systems			
Operating expenses	25,596,000	15,300,000	23,000,000
Capital equipment	289,000	---	---
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	25,885,000	15,300,000	23,000,000
D. Biofuels energy systems			
Operating expenses	26,749,000	11,600,000	19,600,000
Capital equipment	577,000	600,000	600,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	27,326,000	12,200,000	20,200,000
E. Wind energy systems			
Operating expenses	12,055,000	8,080,000	12,080,000
Mod 5-B	12,000,000	---	4,500,000
Capital equipment	770,000	170,000	170,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	24,825,000	8,250,000	16,750,000
F. Ocean energy systems			
Operating expenses	4,811,000	2,500,000	4,500,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	131,706,000	63,550,000	104,750,000
II. Other solar energy			
A. International solar energy program - OE	962,000	500,000	500,000
B. Solar technology transfer			
Operating expenses	2,983,000	1,950,000	2,450,000
Capital equipment	---	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, Solar technology transfer	2,983,000	2,000,000	2,500,000
D. Solar Energy Research Institute			
Capital equipment	251,000	315,000	315,000
Construction:			
General plant projects	1,993,000	230,000	230,000
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute	2,244,000	545,000	545,000
F. Resource assessment			
Operating expenses	914,000	700,000	500,000
Capital equipment	48,000	---	---
Subtotal, Resource assessment	962,000	700,000	500,000
G. Program support - OE	1,251,000	897,000	500,000
H. Program direction - OE	4,516,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Subtotal, Other solar energy	12,918,000	8,742,000	8,645,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY	144,624,000	72,292,000	113,395,000
(Operating expenses)	(139,060,000)	(69,927,000)	(111,030,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(5,564,000)	(2,365,000)	(2,365,000)

GEOTHERMAL

Fiscal year 1986 appropriation	$26,681,000
Fiscal year 1987 estimate	17,930,000
Fiscal year 1987 recommendation	17,930,000
Change from estimate	

Geothermal resources include steam, hot water, geopressured methane, hot dry rock, and magma. The geothermal energy research and development program is aimed at resolving the technical problems which include uncertainties in determining size and life of reservoirs, unusually high drilling costs and lack of well stimulation techniques, the need for injection technology for economic disposal of spent brines, major corrosion and materials problems, environmental problems, and lack of efficient components.

A total of $4,200,000 is provided in FY 1987 to continue the existing contract work in three field wells, Pleasant Bayou, Hulin and Gladys McCall, to be used to resolve technical issues on production of hydrocarbons and brine, and generation of electricity using the energy content of the produced fluids. An additional $2,000,000 is provided for continuation of the deep-well research project.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

Fiscal year 1986 appropriation	$28,840,000
Fiscal year 1987 estimate	16,219,000
Fiscal year 1987 recommendation	28,019,000
Change from estimate	+11,800,000

The electric energy systems and storage program includes research in determining the effects of electric power transmission on humans and animals; development of technology for improving the reliability of the transmission and distribution of electricity; and research and development in systems technology and thermal and chemical storage.

The electric energy systems program is mainly applied research. That is, research to advance the state-of-the-art in electric system concepts and technologies. This means that virtually all projects have a known objective or application, with the research carried to proof-of-concept and risks understood. Electric energy storage systems includes battery, thermal and mechanical and chemical storage.

For fiscal year 1987, $3,700,000 is provided for program activities of the Hawaii Deep Water Cable project. The major program activities to be undertaken in fiscal year 1987 include an exhaustive battery of laboratory tests on the cable, designing the necessary cable handling equipment and preparing the protocol for the at-sea test. Additional adjustments are identified in the table following this section.

A total of $1,700,000 is provided for completion of the third year of a three-year research contract for development activities on the zinc-bromine battery and $1,005,000 is provided for continuation of research on the aluminum/air battery. Additionally, $4,000,000 is provided for thermal energy storage, particularly the seasonal storage program. This includes $1,000,000 for seasonal storage research, $1,500,000 for industrial storage research and $1,500,000 for diurnal thermal storage. Of the funds available, $2,000,000 shall be

made available to Argonne National Laboratory for the FeS2 system and the Battery Analysis and Diagnostics Laboratory.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
GEOTHERMAL			
I. Hydrothermal industrialization			
Operating expenses	1,925,000	---	---
II. Geopressured resources			
Operating expenses	4,426,000	17,150,000	17,150,000
III. Geothermal technology development			
Operating expenses	19,548,000	---	---
Capital equipment	481,000	---	---
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	20,029,000	---	---
V. Program direction - OE	701,000	780,000	780,000
Management initiatives - OE	-400,000	---	---
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	26,681,000	17,930,000	17,930,000
(Operating expenses)	(26,200,000)	(17,930,000)	(17,930,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(481,000)	---	---
HYDROPOWER			
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE	436,000	---	---
III. Program direction - OE	45,000	---	---
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER	481,000	---	---
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE			
I. Electric energy systems			
A. Electric field effects research			
Operating expenses	2,887,000	7,269,000	5,269,000
B. Reliability research			
Operating expenses	2,887,000	---	2,000,000
C. System technology			
Operating expenses	5,418,000	---	3,700,000
D. Program direction - OE	356,000	350,000	350,000
Subtotal,Electric energy systems	11,548,000	7,619,000	11,319,000
II. Energy Storage Systems			
A. Battery storage			
Operating expenses	13,828,000	8,600,000	12,300,000
Capital equipment	192,000	---	---
Subtotal, Battery storage	14,020,000	8,600,000	12,300,000
B. Thermal and mechanical storage			
Operating expenses	2,945,000	---	4,000,000
C. Program direction - OE	327,000	---	400,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	17,292,000	8,600,000	16,700,000
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	28,840,000	16,219,000	28,019,000
(Operating expenses)	(28,648,000)	(16,219,000)	(28,019,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(192,000)	---	---

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Fiscal year 1986 appropriation	$621,795,000
Fiscal year 1987 estimate	631,500,000
Fiscal year 1987 recommendation	618,300,000
Change from estimate	−13,200,000

The fiscal year 1987 budget request for nuclear energy programs is $631,500,000 compared with $621,795,000 provided under the fiscal year 1986 Appropriation Act. Activities in this area include converter reactor research, commercial nuclear waste, remedial action, and nuclear fuel cycle. The Committee's recommended changes to the President's budget request are discussed below.

CIVILIAN NUCLEAR RESEARCH PROGRAM

The Committee continues to be concerned about the future of the nuclear power option in the United States. While significant progress has been made in recent years, particularly the last two years, the direction of the nuclear research program is moving away from addressing current and long-term needs of the civilian nuclear power industry which are of vital interest to the Nation's economic and national security concerns and moving closer to dealing with the relatively narrow needs for specific power sources for limited space and defense projects. While these may be interesting and novel applications and provide some incidental benefits to nuclear power, they still represent very limited applications at a very high cost to the civilian research program. They are also a large commitment of talent and resources of the national laboratories. The Secretary of Energy should examine the relationship between the needs of the civilian nuclear research program and defense program needs and assure that the appropriate balance is made between the two. In addition, the Department shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations a report identifying the allocation of nuclear research funds, facilities and manpower between space and defense programs and other nuclear research activities.

The Department should, continue on the course it is on to identify the highest priority research objectives and advanced reactor concept, as endorsed by the Energy Research Advisory Board, and proceed to develop that technology in the most expeditious fashion practical.

Light Water Reactor Programs.—The Committee recommendation provides $38,000,000 for LWR research, including $10,000,000 for safety and licensing activities, $15,000,000 for advanced LWR technology, and $13,000,000 for TMI activities. The Department should assure that it complies with the terms and conditions of the so-called "Thornburg Agreement" relative to funding obligations for completion of the TMI clean-up and research objectives. The Committee continues to support the Department's Light Water Reactor programs. The Department's cooperative programs on safety and licensing and advanced light water reactor technology should be conducted to maximize the opportunities for development and licensing certification of advanced light water reactors.

Advanced Reactor Research and Development.—The recommendation would provide a total of $64,500,000 for advanced reactor R&D. Because the budget justification material and the hearing

record did not adequately identify nor justify the proposed uses for funds requested, the Committee directs that not less than $15,000,000 each be available for HTGR and IFR/LMR technologies primarily for safety analysis and demonstration; not less than $12,000,000 be provided for innovative LMR concepts, and an additional $6,000,000 for highest priority nuclear fuel cycle remote technology activities. The Department shall redirect the nuclear fuel cycle program to focus on international collaboration and remote technology. Funds are provided to support U.S.-Japanese collaboration and to support development of advanced remote technology for nuclear reactors and other non-fuel cycle applications. This program should specifically address emergency operations in high-radiation, high-temperature environments.

Space and Defense Power Systems.—The Committee recommendation provides a total of $58,650,000 for space and defense power systems. This includes funds for the SP–100 program operating and capital expenses; for isotope power systems and for the multi-megawatt power systems. The Department shall maintain the cost-shared ratios identified in the hearing record relative to the DOD and NASA programs and shall maintain a clear and distinct program, financing and accounting structure that definitely separates defense and space nuclear power system costs and activities from those of the civilian nuclear research program.

Advanced Nuclear Systems.—The Committee recommendation provides $20,600,000, the FY 1986 funding level, because neither the justification material nor the hearing record explained or justified the requirement for the requested increase of $4,000,000.

Facilities.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $6,000,000 to increase and maintain at close to current levels the operations at FFTF. Also, the recommendation reduces operations at ETEC in anticipation of savings to be derived from addition of the power-pack to ETEC facilities.

The Committee is aware of a proposal sponsored by the City of Richland, Washington, and the Benton and Franklin County Public Utility Districts for the development of a plan to privately finance, design, construct and operate an electrical generating facility using waste heat from the DOE's Fast Flux Test Facility at Hanford, Washington.

The Committee agrees to the use of up to $5,500,000 from funds previously appropriated for the CRBR project for this initial effort. By completing and using the steam generators previously being manufactured for the CRBR, this project, if viable, would allow the DOE to obtain some of the benefits of the large Government investment in LMFBR steam generator technology, consistent with the Committee's previous direction to maximize the benefits of the CRBR project to the LMFBR program.

The following conditions apply: (1) The $5,500,000 is to be repaid from project revenues; (2) The facility would be financed, owned and operated at no additional cost to the Government; (3) DOE would receive payment for energy provided; (4) DOE would retain title to CRBR steam generators; (5) There is to be no continuation or extension of FFTF operations beyond the DOE's requirements of the FFTF for its research and development program; (6) The effort should include sufficient engineering to provide a detailed cost esti-

mate to realistically assess the economic and programmatic benefits to DOE as well as the cost of power for purposes of non-Federal financing. The project shall include provision for an alternate, fossil-fuel steam source; and (7) Finally, potential private-sector participants in the project shall contribute not less than 10% of the total study costs associated with this review.

The Committee believes this effort should proceed promptly and the results reported back to Committee within one year.

Formerly Utilized Sites.—The recommendation provides for $23,600,000, a reduction of $2,000,000, to provide for the highest priority programs.

Uranium Mill Tailings Program.—The recommendation provides for a $10,000,000 reduction in this program due to current fiscal constraints.

Surplus Facilities.—The recommendation provides for a $6,000,000 reduction in the surplus facilities program due to fiscal constraints.

Byproducts Program.—The fiscal year 1984 budget initiated funding for a number of food irradiator projects. Funding continued in the FY 1986 budget and five specific irradiator projects were begun. The FY 1987 recommendation provides an additional $5,000,000 for continuation of these projects, and specifies in the language of the bill that all funds for irradiator projects shall be available only for the following five projects: Oklahoma, Red-Ark Development Authority; Florida, Department of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs; Iowa, Iowa State University; Hawaii, Department of Planning and Economic Development; Washington, Port of Pasco. These are all public agencies that have an ability to manage these projects and provide continuity for their future operation.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
I. NUCLEAR ENERGY R&D			
A. Light water reactor			
Operating expense	46,158,000	41,000,000	38,000,000
B. Advanced reactor R & D			
Operating expense	123,432,000	47,000,000	62,000,000
Capital equipment	5,118,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Subtotal, Advanced reactor R & D	128,550,000	49,500,000	64,500,000
C. Space & defense power systems			
Operating expense	16,367,000	60,370,000	48,370,000
Capital equipment	1,924,000	6,280,000	5,280,000
Construction:			
86-N-105 SP-100 fac. mods - NEDL	1,924,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Space & defense power systems	20,215,000	71,650,000	58,650,000
D. Advanced nuclear systems			
Operating expense	17,854,000	20,600,000	17,600,000
Capital equipment	1,636,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	19,490,000	23,600,000	20,600,000
E. Facilities			
Operating expense	124,173,000	115,200,000	121,200,000
Capital equipment	4,503,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Construction:			
87-N-101 Mods to reactors	962,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
87-N-102 GPF	1,732,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-N-602 ANAL. INEL. ID. security upgrades	866,000	600,000	600,000
Subtotal, construction	3,560,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Subtotal, Facilities	132,236,000	121,800,000	127,800,000
F. Water cooled breeder			
Operating expense	18,955,000	13,800,000	13,800,000
G. Program direction - OE	8,080,000	9,550,000	7,550,000
Subtotal, NUCLEAR ENERGY R & D	375,684,000	330,900,000	330,900,000
(Operating expense)	(357,019,000)	(307,520,000)	(308,520,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(18,665,000)	(23,380,000)	(22,380,000)
II. Remedial actions & Waste technology			
1. Formerly utilized sites remedial action program			
Operating expenses	18,763,000	25,400,000	23,400,000
Capital equipment	192,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	18,955,000	25,600,000	23,600,000
2. Grand Junction remedial action OE	866,000	800,000	800,000
3. Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program			
Operating expenses	90,397,000	123,700,000	113,700,000
Capital equipment	962,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Subtotal, Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program	91,359,000	126,000,000	116,000,000
4. Surplus facilities			
Operating expenses	39,787,000	56,000,000	50,000,000
Capital equipment	144,000	400,000	400,000
Subtotal, Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities	39,931,000	56,400,000	50,400,000
5. West Valley			
Operating expenses	61,581,000	79,000,000	79,000,000
6. Low level waste			
Operating expenses	4,474,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Capital equipment	96,000	---	---
Subtotal, Low level waste	4,570,000	4,000,000	4,000,000

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
7. Waste technology & By-products			
Operating expenses	10,584,000	---	5,000,000
Capital equipment	433,000	---	---
Subtotal, Waste technology & By-products	11,017,000	---	5,000,000
8. Program direction - OE	1,766,000	2,300,000	2,100,000
Subtotal, Remedial actions & Waste technology	230,047,000	294,100,000	280,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(228,220,000)	(291,200,000)	(278,000,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(1,827,000)	(2,900,000)	(2,900,000)
OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT			
IX. Civilian waste R&D			
A. Spent Fuel Storage R & D			
Operating expenses	7,496,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
Capital equipment	1,058,000	---	---
Subtotal, Spent fuel storage R & D	8,554,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
B. Alternative disposal concepts			
Operating expenses	5,292,000	---	---
Capital equipment	1,915,000	---	---
Subtotal, Alternative disposal concepts	7,207,000	---	---
E. Program direction	303,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Civilian waste R&D	16,064,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	621,795,000	631,500,000	618,300,000
(Operating expenses)	(598,330,000)	(605,220,000)	(593,020,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(23,465,000)	(26,280,000)	(25,280,000)

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

Fiscal year 1986 appropriation	$46,921,000
Fiscal year 1987 estimate	76,098,000
Fiscal year 1987 recommendation	57,935,000
Change from estimate	−18,163,000

The Environment, Safety and Health (ES&H) program was established to assure protection of the environment, safety of DOE workers and the public, and protection of DOE property. The ES&H program implements these goals by defining DOE policy, providing guidance and technical assistance, performing safety related research of a generic nature and performing independent overview and assessment.

The Committee recommendation provides for a substantial increase in environment, safety and health programs of the Department of Energy. This represents a reduction of $18,163,000 in the request because the Committee felt the justification for such a large increase was insufficient to support the requested program. In addition, much of the activity proposed to be done in the Department's new environmental initiative appears to be redundant of existing, ongoing surveys and studies at DOE installations and facilities and would merely duplicate reviews already done. While the Committee applauds the Department's effort to consolidate the management and oversight of the environment, safety and health programs and to establish priorities in these categories, it desires greater efficiency and economy in accomplishing these objectives. The Department should proceed with this initiative with a greater effort to recognize the current fiscal constraints that prevail throughout the other programs of the Federal Government.

ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 1986 appropriation	$176,821,000
Fiscal year 1987 estimate	196,565,000
Fiscal year 1987 recommendation	191,065,000
Change from estimate	−5,500,000

The environment programs of the Department of Energy are to assure that the Department complies with all current environmental, safety and health statutes and provides for research in related programs. The Administration request is $196,565,000 in fiscal year 1987. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1987 is $191,065,000 with the following changes:

The Committee recommendation provides for a $5,500,000 reduction for environment research and development in light of current fiscal constraints.

LIQUEFIED GASEOUS FUELS SPILL TEST FACILITY

The Committee directs the DOE to develop a Memorandum of Understanding with EPA and DOT establishing a long-range plan for collaborative research at the Liquefied Gaseous Fuels Spill Test Facility. (To be funded by DOE at about $1,000,000 per year.) In addition, the Committee directs DOE to continue to provide baseline operations support for facility maintenance and technical interaction with potential sponsors of research. (To be funded by DOE at about $500,000 per year.)

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
I. Environment, safety and health			
Operating expenses	45,478,000	73,998,000	55,835,000
Capital equipment	1,443,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
Total, Environment safety and health	46,921,000	76,098,000	57,935,000
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY			
I. Spill test facility			
Operating expenses	1,732,000	1,200,000	2,000,000
ENVIRONMENT R & D			
I. Biological and Environmental Research			
Operating expenses	166,237,000	190,965,000	175,965,000
Capital equipment	7,457,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Construction:			
87-R-120 General plant projects, various locations	3,127,000	3,500,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Biological and environ. research	176,821,000	192,965,000	187,465,000
II. Program direction - OE			
A. Bio and env. research - PD	3,129,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
Total, Environment R & D	179,950,000	196,565,000	191,065,000
(Operating expenses)	(169,366,000)	(184,565,000)	(179,565,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(10,584,000)	(12,000,000)	(11,500,000)

MAGNETIC FUSION

Fiscal year 1986 appropriation	$365,469,000
Fiscal year 1987 estimate	333,000,000
Fiscal year 1987 recommendation	358,000,000
Change from estimate	+25,000,000

The goal of the magnetic fusion program is to provide electric energy generated by commercial-scale fusion reactors. The achievement of this goal, however, is a long way off and considerable basic scientific research must be successfully done before development of reactor devices that would be commercially viable could be considered.

During fiscal year 1985, at the direction of the Congress, the Department of Energy restructured the magnetic fusion program to recognize fiscal constraints as well as to maximize and redirect research priorities consistent with agreed upon program objectives. That restructured program was to be the program on which magnetic fusion would be based throughout this decade and was the basis for achieving consensus among the many diverse interests of the magnetic fusion community. The Congress, in its wisdom, agreed with the program as it was restructured and recommended by the Department. However, in spite of initiatives taken by the President to increase peaceful international collaborative fusion research with the Soviet Union, the Administration's FY 1987 budget request declined by $50,000,000 from an already severely constrained FY 1986 level. Because of this Committee's concern and belief in the need to maintain a viable magnetic fusion research program, not only for its own value but because of the very important physics research and training that takes place as a result of the fusion program, the recommendation provides for an increase of $25,000,000 above the request to restore a portion of the reductions. These funds are to be used to maintain mirror fusion research as a working alternative so as not to eliminate the primary competitor to Tokamak concepts. In addition, funds are added to maintain the schedule to achieve breakeven at TFTR in the 1988–1990 timeframe. In view of the restoration of funds for the mirror fusion program, the Committee expects that operating support for the Doublet III device be restored to 1986 levels in order to meet international commitments, and to allow neutral beam and RF hearing experiments to carry on as previously agreed to with the Japanese, and for the TARA device to provide data support for the MFTF–B. Finally, additional funds may be made available to university research initiatives to assist in maintaining a viable fusion program.

The Committee, in last year's report, indicated its support of the strategy adopted in the DOE Magnetic Fusion Program Plan to achieve its goal of the establishment of the scientific and technological data base required for the ultimate exploitation of fusion energy. Such a strategy requires a well-integrated effort with relatively stable funding levels and continuity of departmental support.

The Committee also recognizes the record of innovative contributions to the national magnetic fusion program from the University research programs, as well as the importance of these graduate programs as a source of highly qualified, technologically oriented

scientists. As DOE seeks to maintain a proper balance in its support of major program elements, cognizance must be taken of the special needs of these institutions, especially with respect to their role in the exploration of new ideas and of generic problems, and to their commitment to the education and training of graduate students.

The Committee notes with interest that the United States fusion community, through its Magnetic Fusion Advisory Committee, and the larger world community through the Summit Working Group on Controlled Thermonuclear Fusion and its Technical Working Party, have reached a consensus on the nature and timing of the major facilities and development efforts required to establish the feasibility of fusion as a long-term energy source for mankind. Among the proposals endorsed by the international community is the development of an experiment which would provide, at modest cost, the opportunity for detailed investigation of an ignited Tokamak plasma under equilibrium-burn conditions. A preliminary study of such a device, to be constructed in the United States for operation in the early 1990's is now under development and review within the Department of Energy. This experiment would strengthen the United States' position as it continues to negotiate a possible international collaboration program on a larger fusion engineering test facility and would maintain the momentum of the domestic program.

It appears that the initiative begun during Summit discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union may result in a concrete international fusion project that would result in funding requirements not identified in any budget submission currently before the Congress. Any funding proposed to be obligated on such an initiative, or studies or other activities related to it, shall be presented to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees under the normal reprogramming procedures and identified separately in subsequent budget submissions.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
FUSION			
I. Magnetic fusion			
A. Confinement systems			
Operating expenses	188,650,000	177,500,000	202,500,000
Capital equipment	14,529,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
Subtotal, Confinement systems	203,179,000	184,600,000	209,600,000
B. Development and technology			
Operating expenses	57,059,000	50,510,000	50,510,000
Capital equipment	4,330,000	1,890,000	1,890,000
Subtotal, Development and technology	61,389,000	52,400,000	52,400,000
C. Applied plasma physics			
Operating expenses	69,692,000	70,700,000	70,700,000
Capital equipment	5,619,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Subtotal, Applied plasma physics	75,311,000	75,200,000	75,200,000
D. Planning and projects			
Operating expenses	5,528,000	4,780,000	4,780,000
Capital equipment	3,801,000	3,820,000	3,820,000
Construction:			
87-R-901 General plant projects, various locations	8,764,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
78-3-A Mirror fusion test facility	3,889,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	12,653,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
Subtotal, Planning and projects	21,982,000	16,800,000	16,800,000
F. Program direction - OE	3,608,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Total, Fusion	365,469,000	333,000,000	358,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(324,537,000)	(307,490,000)	(332,490,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(40,932,000)	(25,510,000)	(25,510,000)

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

Fiscal year 1986 appropriation	$495,416,000
Fiscal year 1987 estimate	523,985,000
Fiscal year 1987 recommendation	582,678,000
Change from estimate	+58,693,000

The Administration requested $523,985,000 for supporting research and technical analysis including basic energy sciences. The Committee recommendation provides $582,678,000, and makes several adjustments.

Cooperative and Other Programs.—Since 1981, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Educational Foundation and Jackson State University have enjoyed a productive relationship intended to enhance computer science and scientific research at all three institutions. The Committee is encouraged by the success of this effort and would like it to serve as a model for the rest of the Nation. As such, the Department is directed to commit not less than $1,000,000 in FY 1987 to maintain and support this relationship.

The Office of Energy Research Nuclear Medicine program has made significant advances in the detection and treatment of cancer. The Committee strongly believes that these research efforts are at a critical juncture and deserve continued Federal support. Therefore, the Committee recommends a $3,000,000 increase in the nuclear medicine positron emission budget for research in monoclonal antibody-based imaging and treatment methods based on immunoconjugates.

Materials Sciences.—The Committee recommendation provides $3,000,000 in the budget request for preconstruction R&D on the 6 GeV synchrotron light source at Argonne National Laboratory.

Center for New Industrial Materials.—The Committee recommendation provides for an increase of $6,000,000 above the budget for the Center for New Industrial Materials at the Iowa State University. This is the full Federal contribution to the capital cost of the facility. The Center shall build upon existing DOE materials research activities and expand into new materials. The Federal contribution will be used for construction of the facility and initial capital equipment for the Center. It is the Committee's intention that substantial state and private sector contributions will be made to the Center in addition to the Federal share. It is the further understanding of the Committee that a substantial part of the design and engineering effort has been done on the facility, that the Federal contribution to the capital cost of the facility not exceed 50% and that no continuing operating expenses be required of the Federal Government.

Center for Nuclear Imaging Research.—The Committee recommendation provides for an increase of $12,300,000 above the budget for the Center for Nuclear Imaging Research at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. The Committee expects this to be the total Federal contribution to the Center. The Center will develop imaging technologies, such as positron emission tomography and nuclear magnetic resonance, which are based upon the properties of atomic nuclei. Such technologies have significant research potential in biology and medicine, and the Center's objectives will in-

clude imaging biologically and medically significant isotopes such as carbon 13, sodium 23, phosphorus 31 and rubidium 82. The Federal contribution will be used for the construction of a facility for the Center and for instrumentation research and development. It is the Committee's understanding that substantial state and private sector contributions will be made to the Center in addition to the Federal share. It is the further understanding of the Committee that a significant part of the design and engineering effort is complete on the facility for the Center and that the cost estimates are reasonably firm.

St. Christopher's Hospital for Children—Energy Demonstration Project.—The Committee recommendation provides for an increase of $14,800,000 above the budget for St. Christopher's Hospital for Children. This is the total Federal contribution to the hospital demonstration project. The Hospital will utilize new and evolving energy source technologies and function as a model of energy efficiency design. It is expected that this project will result in the development of new energy technologies, including solar energy, which in turn will be utilized and shared with other institutions across the Nation. The continued use and refinement of alternative energy consumption techniques, could significantly reduce hospital operating costs and overall health related costs nationwide and it is expected that this facility will prove vital in this area. The Federal contribution to this project will be used for the construction of and equipment for a new medical center for children and its energy-related elements. It is the Committee's understanding that substantial state and private sector contributions will be made to the Hospital in addition to the Federal share. It is the further understanding of the Committee that a significant part of the design and engineering effort has been completed and that the cost estimates are reasonably firm.

Energy Research Complex.—The Committee recommendation includes an increase of $16,300,000 above the budget for the Energy Research Complex at the University of South Carolina. This is the total Federal contribution to the facility. The Center will provide a multi-disciplinary approach to a variety of energy research activities now done and planned to be done at the University. The Federal contribution will be used for construction of the facility and initial capital equipment. It is the Committee's understanding that substantial state and private contributions will be made in addition to the Federal share, that a significant part of the design and engineering effort has been completed on the facility and that the cost estimates are reasonably firm. It is anticipated that no further Federal continuing operating costs will be provided or required.

Center for Excellence in Education—Energy Utilization Performance Project.—The Committee recommendation provides for an increase of $3,800,000 above the budget for the energy-related elements of the Center for Excellence in Education at Indiana University. This is an ongoing project that is now partially Federally funded. This project would emphasize a variety of energy systems utilization and serve as a model demonstration center for the Nation.

Applied Mathematical Sciences.—The Committee recommendation provides for an increase of $6,000,000 above the request for ap-

plied mathematical sciences. The Florida State University Supercomputer Center is allocated $11,400,000 of the total amount available in this activity. The Committee includes an additional $1,500,000 for advanced computing activities at Argonne National Laboratory.

Biological Energy Research.—The Committee has provided an additional $600,000 for Biological Energy Research to continue and expand the Oregon Graduate Center's objective oriented fundamental research in biological and biochemical sciences; specifically, in the field of biomass bioprocessing.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS			
I. Basic energy sciences			
A. Nuclear sciences			
Operating expenses	41,445,000	46,913,000	46,913,000
Capital equipment	2,457,000	2,930,000	2,930,000
Construction:			
87-R-400 General plant projects, various locations	96,000	150,000	150,000
87-R-401 Accelerator and Reactor Improvements and modifications, various locations	1,155,000	---	---
Subtotal, Nuclear sciences	45,153,000	49,993,000	49,993,000
B. Materials sciences			
Operating expenses	134,248,000	156,931,000	156,931,000
Capital equipment	11,979,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
Construction:			
87-R-401 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	1,727,000	2,583,000	2,583,000
87-R-403 Neutron Scattering experimental halls, Los Alamos, New Mexico	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
87-R-406 1-2 GeV stnch rod SC,LBL	---	1,500,000	1,500,000
87-R- Center for New Industrial Materials, Iowa State University	---	---	6,000,000
85-ER-133 Univ of Oregon Fac., Univ of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon	8,179,000	---	---
86-R-300 Atlanta	4,330,000	---	7,500,000
84-ER-111 NSLS	6,928,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
84-ER-112 Center for advanced material	11,008,000	10,560,000	10,560,000
84-ER-113 SSRL enhancement	2,463,000	1,717,000	1,717,000
84-ER-115 Nat'l center for chemical research	7,698,000	---	4,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	42,333,000	23,960,000	41,460,000
Subtotal, Materials sciences	188,560,000	196,391,000	213,891,000
C. Chemical sciences			
Operating expenses	78,123,000	86,419,000	81,419,000
Capital equipment	8,506,000	9,555,000	9,555,000
Construction:			
87-R-400 General plant projects, various locations	3,781,000	3,630,000	3,000,000
87-R-401 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	---	300,000	300,000
87-R-405 Combustion research facility, Phase II, Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California	---	300,000	300,000
85-ER-403 Kansas State University	1,828,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, Construction	5,609,000	5,430,000	4,800,000
Subtotal, Chemical sciences	92,238,000	101,404,000	95,774,000
E. Applied mathematical sciences			
Operating expenses	37,925,000	32,785,000	38,785,000
Capital equipment	1,030,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Construction: Demo ctr for info tech, Brown	4,811,000	---	5,000,000
Subtotal, Applied mathematical sciences	43,766,000	33,885,000	44,885,000

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
F. Engineering and geosciences			
Operating expenses	25,571,000	29,412,000	29,412,000
Capital equipment	1,443,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
Construction:			
Energy and Mineral Res Ctr, Ala	7,698,000	---	---
87-R- Energy Research Complex, Univ. of South Carolina	---	---	16,300,000
Subtotal, Engineering and geosciences	34,712,000	31,162,000	47,462,000
G. Advanced energy projects			
Operating expenses	7,286,000	8,932,000	5,000,000
Capital equipment	308,000	330,000	330,000
Subtotal, Advanced energy projects	7,594,000	9,262,000	5,330,000
H. Biological energy research			
Operating expenses	11,960,000	14,538,000	14,538,000
Capital equipment	515,000	610,000	610,000
Construction:			
Ctr for Energy and Biomed Tech, Tulane	5,773,000	---	---
Center for Nuclear Imaging Research	---	---	12,300,000
St. Christopher's Hospital for Children energy demonstration project	---	---	14,800,000
Subtotal, Biological energy research	18,248,000	15,148,000	42,248,000
I. Program direction - OE	3,499,000	4,125,000	4,125,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	433,770,000	441,370,000	503,708,000
(Operating expenses)	(340,057,000)	(380,055,000)	(377,123,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(93,713,000)	(61,315,000)	(126,585,000)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. & Univ support			
A. Energy research analysis - OE			
1. Assessment projects	2,598,000	3,550,000	2,000,000
B. University research support - OE			
Operating expenses:			
2. University reactor fuel assistance	3,753,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
3. University laboratory coop. program	5,773,000	7,075,000	5,075,000
5. Energy manpower assessment program	385,000	500,000	500,000
6. Education and training	385,000	800,000	800,000
7. Visiting scientist program	---	700,000	700,000
8. Center for Excellence in Education	---	---	3,800,000
Subtotal, University research support - OE	10,296,000	10,975,000	12,775,000
C. Advisory and oversight - OE	2,674,000	2,900,000	2,500,000
D. University research instrumentation	6,254,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, & Univ sup	21,822,000	22,425,000	22,275,000

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
Multiprogram Energy Laboratories -- Fac. Sup.			
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities			
Construction:			
87-R-751 Lab res. 1 at PNL	---	2,100,000	2,100,000
87-R-752 Piping sys. res. at ORNL	---	725,000	725,000
87-R-753 Rehab. lab space at ANL	---	1,235,000	1,235,000
87-R-755 Mech. sys. rehab. at ANL	---	1,100,000	1,100,000
87-R-756 Water line rep. at ANL	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
87-R-757 Elec. sys. rehab. at LBL	---	300,000	300,000
87-R-758 Rehab. mech. util. at LBL	---	1,050,000	1,050,000
87-R-759 Upgrade steam dist. sys. at ORNL	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
86-R-726 Fire protection improvements (BNL)	481,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
86-R-727 Upgrade fire protection (ORNL)	---	---	---
85-R-701 Central chilled water facility (BNL)	6,832,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
85-R-702 Replace laboratory roofs (ANL)	2,983,000	2,392,000	2,392,000
85-R-703 Electrical dist. system restoration	---	1,400,000	1,400,000
85-P-706 Medical facility (LLNL)	2,694,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
85-R-707 Hanford site fire alarm system upgra	1,708,000	1,225,000	1,225,000
85-R-709 Central chilled water plant (ANL)	962,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
85-R-711 Upgrade envir. monitoring system (OR	2,406,000	---	---
85-R-712 Central chilled water system restor	1,0 ,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)	2,973,000	2,008,000	2,008,000
80-ES-11 Idaho Lab Facility (INEL)	722,000	---	---
Anticipated project slippage	---	---	-3,495,000
Subtotal, Multi-program facilities	22,819,000	34,935,000	31,440,000
B. Environmental compliance			
Operating expenses	9,307,000	14,255,000	14,255,000
Capital Equipment	962,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction:			
87-R-770 General Plant Projects (ORNL)	3,849,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Upgrade, Phase II (ORNL)	---	---	---
86-R-801 Nonradiological process waste treat	2,887,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	6,736,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotal, Environmental Compliance Program	17,005,000	25,255,000	25,255,000
Total, Multiprogram Laboratories Facilities Suppo	39,824,000	60,190,000	56,695,000
Total, Supporting research and tech. analysis	495,416,000	523,985,000	582,678,000
(Operating expenses)	(371,186,000)	(416,735,000)	(413,653,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(124,230,000)	(107,250,000)	(169,025,000)

OTHER ENERGY SUPPLY ACTIVITIES

Fiscal Year 1986 appropriation	$27,619,000
Fiscal Year 1987 estimate	31,162,000
Fiscal Year 1988 recommendation	31,162,000
Change from estimate	

The Committee recommendation for other energy supply activities in Energy Supply, Research and Development is the same as the request.

Other Changes, Energy Supply, R&D.—The Committee recommendation provides for the application of $684,158,000 in prior year unobligated/unexpended balances from the Uranium Enrichment Program to be applied against the Energy Supply, Research and Development appropriation in FY 1987. In addition, funds proposed for deferral of certain projects which were included in the disapproval of deferral 86-D-38 in the FY 1986 Urgent Supplemental bill have been included in the FY 1986 column of the tables in this report and are available for obligation in FY 1986 and 1987.

RECOMMENDED SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

61-313 O - 86 - 4

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT			
I. Policy and Management			
A. Policy and management - OE - ER	84,000	550,000	550,000
B. Policy and management - OE - NE	1,732,000	1,810,000	1,810,000
C. Policy and management - CE	1,681,000	1,527,000	1,527,000
Subtotal, Policy and management	3,497,000	3,887,000	3,887,000
ENERGY APPLICATIONS			
Technical Information & Management Program			
Operating expenses	13,072,000	13,848,000	13,848,000
Capital equipment	550,000	850,000	850,000
Support from other programs	-1,209,000	-3,923,000	-3,923,000
Subtotal, Technical Information & Management Prog	12,413,000	10,775,000	10,775,000
II. In-house energy management			
Operating expenses	1,895,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Construction:			
87-A-601 Modification for energy mgmt., vario	4,811,000	9,003,000	9,003,000
86-A-602 Solid waste fired boiler (LANCL)	1,732,000	5,868,000	5,868,000
85-A-602 Fuel storage facility, BNL	1,443,000	57,000	57,000
85-A-604 Combustion air preheaters, energy te	1,828,000	72,000	72,000
85-A-605 Cogeneration facility, BNL	4,811,000	---	---
General reduction (In-House)	-4,811,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	9,814,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management	11,709,000	16,500,000	16,500,000
Subtotal, Energy applications	24,122,000	27,275,000	27,275,000
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,939,528,000	1,899,951,000	2,000,484,000
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances - (NE) ESRD	-19,302,000	---	---
Use of prior year balances - (CE) ESRD	-950,000	---	---
Less proposed transfer for ES&H - (DP) AEDA	-5,617,000	---	---
Less proposed transfer for ES&H - (NE) UE	-250,000	---	---
Less proposed transfer for ES&H - (ER) QS	-300,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (CE) ESRD	65,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (NE) ESRD	183,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (CRW) ESRD	6,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (ESH) ESRD	12,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (ER) ESRD	317,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reductions - (MA) ESRD	5,000	---	---
Use of FY86 Deferral - (CE)ESRD	---	-23,351,000	---
Use of FY86 Deferral - (ER)ESRD	---	-38,200,000	---
Use of PY balances (from UE)	-200,000,000	-584,158,000	-684,158,000
Use of prior year balances - SEPA	-17,400,000	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,696,298,000	1,254,162,000	1,316,326,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,479,043,000)	(1,062,807,000)	(1,064,696,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(217,255,000)	(191,355,000)	(251,630,000)

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$1,174,800,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,271,100,000
Recommended, 1987	1,233,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	58,800,000
Budget estimate, 1987	37,500,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	376,312,000
Budget estimate, 1987	15,300,000
Recommended, 1987	22,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−361,012,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+7,500,000

GROSS REVENUES

Appropiation adjusted, 1986	−1,360,600,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−1,286,400,000
Recommended, 1987	−1,286,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−74,200,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The appropriation recommended for Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities provides for the uranium resource assessment, advanced isotope separation technology, and uranium enrichment programs. In this account, the revenues received from the enrichment of uranium are used to off-set costs incurred by the Department in providing uranium enrichment and other services.

The FY 1987 budget proposal assumes a number of initiatives will occur that will affect the uranium enrichment program and its ability to maintain a stable production capability to provide enriched uranium to provide fuel for the civilian nuclear power generating capacity that currently provides approximately 20% of the Nation's electricity. The Committee has maintained for many years that the uranium enrichment enterprise is an essential element of the Nation's national defense infrastructure and is critical to the economic well-being of the country. For this reason, the continual tampering and tinkering with the enterprise has been and will continue to be counterproductive to maintenance of a stable program. Stability is critical to assuring customer confidence, providing necessary national security demands and maintaining the program at all. For these reasons, the Committee disagrees with much of the Department's proposals to "privatize" the enterprise or parts of it and with other changes proposed in the FY 1987 budget submission.

The Committee recognizes that the Department's uranium enrichment program is an ongoing activity subject to fluctuations in both the demand for these services and the conditions under which they must be supplied. The Committee believes the Department has made good progress in stabilizing its program and operating it on a more business-like basis. More progress is needed. Thus, the Committee expects the Department to continue to work toward re-

structuring the enterprise to assure its long-term financial integrity, and to further stablize the policies already put in place. The Department should move as quickly as possible to address these issues.

Privatization.—Privatization of the uranium enrichment enterprise has been proposed by several Administrations for a number of years with varying degrees of enthusiasm. The lack of enthusiasm has apparently been shared by potential private sector investors because there has never been a serious financial and management proposal submitted to the Government to accomplish privatization. A recent initiative to solicit interest in privatization by the Department received limited substantive private sector response. The loss of nearly half the enriched uranium market to lower cost foreign competition in the past decade, coupled with the poor investment decisions of the Department of Energy and recent adverse court rulings have saddled the enterprise with an enormous debt burden, massive underutilized facilities, and a fickle world market situation that have to be considered by any potential investors. In addition, the unaddressed questions of regulatory requirements that may be imposed on a private sector enterprise by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission introduce an additional element of uncertainty. The costs of environmental clean-up and regulation must also be considered.

The result of the Department's continuing effort to privatize the enrichment enterprise has not improved this picture. Customer uncertainty over prices and availability, inability to assure a long-term customer base, continuing questions over the total debt and repayment obligations and uncertainty over the possibility of introducing competitive, alternative enrichment technologies to meet foreign cost competition only serve to contribute to further erosion of the U.S. uranium enrichment enterprise.

The Committee recommendation provides no funds for studies, reviews, consideration of unsolicited proposals or other proposals or to undertake any initiatives directed at privatization of the uranium enterprise. Use of funds for these purposes shall be submitted as part of a specific budget request or considered as part of a reprogramming proposal. No funds are available to pay for unsolicited proposals relating to the centrifuge program, AVLIS program or any or all parts of the enrichment program without prior specific approval by the Committees on Appropriations. The Department should focus its efforts and energies on the very difficult task of properly managing the enrichment program in a manner which is in the best interest of the public as a whole rather than continuing the fruitless and disruptive efforts to divest the enrichment enterprise. If the Department desires to privatize enrichment, it should submit a specific legislative proposal to do so, and may want to consider establishment of a wholly-owned government corporation as the vehicle to reduce uncertainty in the program.

Advanced Technologies.—The Committee recommendation provides $80,000,000 to continue the AVLIS demonstration and development activity on the schedule presented to and agreed to by the Congress in FY 1986. This would permit a deployment decision by FY 1991-1992 and assure the continued existence of an alternative, lower cost enrichment technology. Funds are included under

project number 81-T-502 to expand facilities to provide for development, refurbishment and administrative activities necessary for full-scale demonstration and economic evaluation of the AVLIS uranium enrichment technology prior to production deployment. The budget justification material proposed spending $6,000,000 for technology transfer and analysis activities. No funds are available for this or related purposes.

Gaseous Diffusion Operations.—The recommendation includes $1,017,600,000 for GDP operations, to provide a $25,000,000 increase in operations to produce more SWUs. This is intended to better optimize existing production capability and maintain the ability to produce SWUs.

Repayment.—The Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 establishes the concept of repayment of certain prior-year net appropriations from uranium enrichment revenues to the Treasury. The targets identified are $110 million in FY 1986; $150 million in FY 1987; and $150 million in FY 1988. The Act stipulated that the Secretary of Energy determine the appropriate repayment amount, that the public be afforded an opportunity to comment on that amount and that the Secretary submit that determination to the Congress prior to submission of the budget for the fiscal year in which the repayment is proposed to be made. Since neither the determination, the public comment nor the submission prior to delivery of the FY 1986 and 1987 budgets was made in accordance with the conditions set forth in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act, the ability to repay the Treasury is in doubt. In light of pending litigation and adverse court rulings affecting the uranium enrichment program, the Committee has recommended no action be taken in regard to the proposal to repay funds in FY 1986 and 1987, and has placed the full authorized target amount of $150,000,000 in FY 1987 in reserve pending subsequent legislative action and satisfactory resolution of these issues and statutory requirements by the Department. The Committee has taken no position in regard to the total amount that is due in repayments to the Treasury but agrees that this shall be established in legislation and not by administrative edict that is not subject to public scrutiny. To the extent inventory of enriched materials proposed to be liquidated during FY 1986, 1987 and beyond to reduce production requirements are part of the repayment balance, the total repayment obligation shall be reduced by a like amount.

The Secretary should assure compliance with the provisions of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act that the amount of repayment have no adverse impact on the supply of enriched material at competitive prices to existing and potential customers.

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
URANIUM ENRICHMENT			
I. Uranium enrichment activities			
A. Gaseous diffusion and operations support			
Operating expenses	1,043,063,000	977,300,000	1,002,300,000
Capital equipment	13,472,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction:			
87-N-501 General plant projects	13,467,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
87-N-502 Cooling tower upgrading Paducah, KY.	---	6,300,000	6,300,000
84-N-404 Power systems protection impr	1,154,000	---	---
84-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase III	2,116,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
83-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase II, gas. dif. plant	1,731,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	18,468,000	14,300,000	14,300,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and suppo	1,075,003,000	992,600,000	1,017,600,000
B. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation			
Operating expenses	109,660,000	50,000,000	72,500,000
Capital equipment	14,429,000	---	---
Construction:			
87-N-503 General plant projects, various loc	2,886,000	---	---
81-T-502 demonstration facilites	---	---	7,500,000
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation	126,975,000	50,000,000	80,000,000
C. Gas centrifuge program closeout activities			
1. Gas centrifuge process development & demo			
Operating expenses	17,315,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Capital equipment	---	---	---
Subtotal, Gas Centrifuge	17,315,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
2. Gas centriuge enrichment plant			
Construction:			
76-8-G Enriched Uranium production facility, Portsmouth, OH	327,057,000	---	---
Subtotal, Gas centrifuge enrichment plant	327,057,000	---	---
Subtotal, Gas centrifugr closeout activities	344,372,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
D. Program direction - OE	4,036,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
Addback of proposed transfer for ES&H	250,000	---	---
Addback of proposed transfer FTE reduction	476,000	---	---
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities	1,551,112,000	1,051,400,000	1,106,400,000
Reserve	---	235,000,000	150,000,000
TOTAL URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	1,551,112,000	1,286,400,000	1,256,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,174,800,000)	(1,271,100,000)	(1,233,600,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(376,312,000)	(15,300,000)	(22,800,000)
III. Offsetting revenues			
Operating expenses	-1,326,900,000	-1,286,400,000	-1,286,400,000
Capital equipment	-14,500,000	---	---
Construction	-19,200,000	---	---
Subtotal, Offsetting revenues	-1,360,600,000	-1,286,400,000	-1,286,400,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT	190,512,000	---	-30,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,174,800,000)	(1,271,100,000)	(1,233,600,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(376,312,000)	(15,300,000)	(22,800,000)
(Offsetting revenues)	(-1,360,600,000)	(-1,286,400,000)	(-1,286,400,000)

General Science and Research Activities

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$655,928,000
Budget estimate, 1987	773,400,000
Recommended, 1987	738,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+82,472,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−35,000,000

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	510,790,000
Budget estimate, 1987	604,900,000
Recommended, 1987	577,900,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+67,110,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−27,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	145,138,000
Budget estimate, 1987	168,500,000
Recommended, 1987	160,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+15,362,000
Budget estimate, 1987	− 8,000,000

The General Science programs are concerned with basic research to discover and understand the fundamental constituents of matter and energy and the basic forces in nature. Understanding of the laws of nature and the basic components from which matter and energy, in all their varied forms are composed, forms the foundation upon all modern science and technology rests. Deeper understanding correspondingly contributes, sometimes in spectaular ways, to all of the scientific disciplines and to our Nation's technological base. The General Science programs are organized into two interrelated scientific programs, High Energy Physics and Nuclear Physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization and on other aspects of our society.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommendation for High Energy Physics totals $519,700,000 which represents a decrease of $27,000,000 compared to the Administration's budget request and an increase of $24,842,000 compared to FY 1986.

During FY 1987 the upgraded Fermilab and the Stanford Linear Collider will be in operation. Accordingly, the Committee supports the Administration's request for increased facility operations. The Committee recommendation for physics research provides for a cost-of-living increase over the appropriations for FY 1986.

The Committee is concerned by the lack of commitment by the Administration with regard to the Superconducting Super Collider. The budget does not include any specific recommendations with regard to funding research for this project pending a decision in FY 1987 with regard to constructing the facility beginning in FY

1988. The Administration has indicated, however, that at least $20 million would be available in FY 1987 if a decision is made to proceed in FY 1988. The Committee recommendation reflects a reduction of the $20,000,000 in availability for the SSC and directs that the Administration should consider a subsequent appropriation request if a decision is made to proceed with the project.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommendation for Nuclear Physics totals $216,200,000 which represents a decrease of $8,000,000 compared to the Administration's request and an increase of $51,728,000 compared to FY 1986.

The Committee recommendation strongly supports the construction of the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility (CEBAF) and provides $17,000,000 which represents a realistic spending requirement to initiate construction of this project.

The Committee recommendation includes funds to maintain the current level of utilization for LAMPF. The U.S. nuclear physics program has developed a long-range plan to provide important new facilities for investigating exciting opportunities to understand the fundamental nature of the nucleus. The construction of these new facilities, such as CEBAF, will be accomplished on top of the existing program so that the important existing facilities, such as LAMPF, can be fully utilized as national resources to the program.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH			
I. High energy physics			
A. Physics research			
Operating expenses	106,268,000	118,600,000	111,600,000
B. Facility operations			
Operating expenses	175,095,000	213,400,000	213,400,000
Capital equipment	66,250,000	73,300,000	73,300,000
Construction:			
87-R-101 Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	10,052,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
87-R-102 General plant projects, various locations	9,957,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
86-R-104 Central Computer Fac. (FERMILAB)	2,968,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
86-R-100 AGS Accum/Booster	1,915,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
84-ER-133 SLAC linear collider (SLC)	21,924,000	---	---
81-E-218 Tevatron I	8,233,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	55,049,000	41,700,000	41,700,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	296,394,000	328,400,000	328,400,000
C. High energy technology			
Operating expenses	88,462,000	95,500,000	75,500,000
D. Other capital equipment - CE	3,734,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
Subtotal, High energy physics	494,858,000	546,700,000	519,700,000
II. Nuclear physics			
A. Medium energy physics			
Operating expenses	73,131,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
B. Heavy ion physics			
Operating expenses	50,150,000	63,700,000	63,700,000
C. Low energy nuclear physics			
Operating expenses	12,087,000	15,700,000	15,700,000
D. Nuclear theory			
Operating expenses	8,999,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
E. Capital equipment	12,637,000	14,770,000	14,770,000
F. Construction:			
87-R-201 Accelerator Improvements and modifications, various locations	3,351,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
87-R-202 General plant projects, various locations	3,351,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
87-R-403 Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, Newport News, Virginia	---	25,000,000	17,000,000
Subtotal Construction	6,702,000	33,300,000	25,300,000
G. Other capital equipment - CE	766,000	1,230,000	1,230,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	164,472,000	224,200,000	216,200,000
(Operating expenses)	(144,367,000)	(174,900,000)	(174,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(20,105,000)	(49,300,000)	(41,300,000)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
III. General Science program direction - OE	2,092,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	661,422,000	773,400,000	738,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(516,284,000)	(604,900,000)	(577,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(145,138,000)	(168,500,000)	(160,500,000)
Adjustments:			
Transfer of appropriation	-6,000,000	---	---
Addback of Proposed Transfer ES&H - (ESH)ESRD	300,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reduction - (ER) GS	206,000	---	---
Total, Adjustments	-5,494,000	---	---
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	655,928,000	773,400,000	738,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(510,790,000)	(604,900,000)	(577,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(145,138,000)	(168,500,000)	(160,500,000)

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$499,037,000
Budget estimate, 1987	769,349,000
Recommended, 1987	677,649,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+178,612,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−91,700,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-425) establishes the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund to finance activities related to development, construction, and operation of a commercial high-level waste repository and studies of Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS) concepts.

The Fund is to be financed by fees paid by nuclear utilities. The budget request in fiscal year 1987 is $769,349,000. Revenues offset required appropriations, with revenues in excess of requirements being retained in the Fund as offsets to future needs.

The Committee continues to strongly support the program activities included in the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund and is of the view that management of the program to date has been satisfactory. The reductions recommended include deletion of funding requested for the Monitored Retrievable Storage Facility because no site has been approved for that and siting funds requested for the second permanent repository have been deleted because of the Department's decision to not proceed with that facility at this time. This does not affect the revenues that accrue to the program.

The Committee is aware of ongoing and successful research being undertaken in Sweden and Canada on the potential for use of lead in canisters destined for permanent storage of high-level nuclear wastes. The Committee is concerned about the absence of similar research by the DOE pursuant to its mandate to evaluate various disposal concepts and materials under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (P.L. 97-425). The Committee believes that high-level nuclear waste canister design should provide protection against the probability of radionuclide release to the environment. The results of Swedish and Canadian research, however, indicate that the use of lead in canisters not only provides increased resistence to geologic stresses and corrosion, but also protects disposal site workers because of lead's well-known gamma shielding properties. The Committee, therefore, directs the DOE to evaluate the use of lead in high-level nuclear waste disposal canisters.

Atomic Energy Defense Activities

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$7,231,664,000
Budget estimate, 1987	8,230,000,000
Recommended, 1987	7,693,900,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+462,236,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−536,100,000

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	5,738,153,000
Budget estimate, 1987	6,523,694,000
Recommended, 1987	6,233,994,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+495,841,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−289,700,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	1,493,511,000
Budget estimate, 1987	1,706,306,000
Recommended, 1987	1,459,906,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−33,605,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−246,400,000

Due to budget restraints, the total appropriation has been reduced by $536,100,000. Generally, this has been accomplished by stretching out activities. The Committee encourages the Department to carefully examine all unexpended obligations in an effort to mitigate the impact of these reductions.

The appropriations recommended for Atomic Energy Defense Activities provide for six principal programs: Weapons Activities; Inertial Confinement Fusion; Special Materials Production; Defense Waste Management; Naval Reactor Development; and Other National Security Programs.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

This program provides for the research, development, engineering, testing, and production of all U.S. nuclear weapons; maintenance of reliable weapons for their stockpile life; and retirement and disposal of nuclear weapons from the stockpile. The fiscal year 1987 recommendation will continue efforts to provide new technology to maintain a modern nuclear force, along with the design and development of new weapons systems in response to defense requirements. Increases are provided for continued production of weapon systems.

The Committee recommendation for Weapons Activities totals $4,214,054,000 of which $3,427,854,000 is the Operating Expenses and $786,200,000 is for Plant and Capital Equipment. This reflects an increase of $250,602,000 compared to fiscal year 1986 appropriations and a decrease of $331,400,000 from the budget request.

Weapons Activities are comprised of the following subcategories: Research and Development, Testing Activities, Production and Surveillance, and Program Direction.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for Research and Development totals $1,155,400,000 which reflects a decrease of $84,500,000 from the budget request.

The budget request included $118,500,000 for the Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) program under the category "Weapons Activities". The Committee continues its strong support for the ICF program and has recommended that the program be funded as a separate category.

The Committee recommends operating funds of $925,400,000 which includes Strategic Defense Initiative funding at approximately the budget request. Funds for the Strategic Defense Initiative may be used only in the amount and in the manner provided for in fiscal year 1987 authorizing language. Within the research

and development operating account, $17,000,000 is provided to support the development of the Plasma Separation Program to meet the Department's requirements for nickel 63 and other isotope enrichment missions.

The Committee recommendation for capital equipment includes $8,000,000 to initiate procurement of platinum free glass which is required to bring the laser amplifiers of the NOVA project up to their rated capacity.

The Committee recommendation for research and development includes the budget request for the Marshall Island program. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to prepare a joint program with the Department of the Interior establishing the individual agency responsibilities as legislated by P.L. 99-239.

The Committee recommendation does not include for the initiation of construction projects 87-D-102 and 87-D-104. The Committee recommendation defers the start of these projects because of budgetary restraints and without prejudice. The Committee notes that similar work is funded in other construction projects. In addition, the recommendation reduces the growth of ongoing construction projects by $17,900,000. The specific project reductions are shown in the detailed tables shown in this section of the report. The recommendation includes $109,370,000 for capital equipment reflecting the budget request.

TESTING ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommendation for Testing Activities totals $669,400,000 which reflects an increase of $102,435,000 compared to fiscal year 1986 and a decrease of $73,400,000 from the budget request.

The Committee recommendation of $570,400,000 in operating funds includes the Strategic Defense Initiative at approximately the budget request. Funds for the Strategic Defense Initiative may be used only in the amount and in the manner provided for in fiscal year 1987 authorizing language. Some testing developmental work will be delayed to later fiscal years. The Committee recommendation for capital equipment funding is $66,000,000 which reflects a reduction of $6,000,000 from the budget request.

Funding for project 85-D-105; Combined Device Assembly Facility, is reduced by $4,000,000 delaying work to future fiscal years.

PRODUCTION AND SURVEILLANCE

The Committee recommendation for Production and Surveillance totals $2,330,704,000 which reflects an increase of $44,751,000 compared to fiscal year 1986 and a decrease of $171,500,000 from the budget request.

The allowance for operating expenses of $1,873,504,000 represents an approximate cost-of-living increase over FY 1986. Because of budget restraints, the Committee recommendation reduces the level of funding for a number of construction projects. The specific project reductions are shown in the detailed tables shown in this section of the report. The recommendations are intended to defer

work without prejudice to later fiscal years. The total allowance for construction is $325,200,000, deferring $76,500,000.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

Program direction is funded at $58,550,000 which is $2,000,000 less than the budget request and allows for a cost-of-living increase.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
I. Weapons activities			
A. Research and development			
Operating expenses	796,951,000	980,700,000	925,400,000
Capital equipment	82,822,000	109,370,000	109,370,000
Construction:			
87-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	19,800,000	21,300,000	21,300,000
87-D-102 Environmental compliance and cleanup LLNL	---	7,000,000	---
87-D-104 Safeguards and security enhancement, phase II, LLNL	---	4,300,000	---
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL	3,600,000	5,400,000	5,400,000
86-D-104 Strategic defenses facility, SNLA	2,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
86-D-105 Instrumentation system laboratory, SNL	3,100,000	8,900,000	6,000,000
86-D-106 Data communications center, LANL	1,000,000	14,000,000	10,000,000
85-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facs revitalization, Phase I, various locations	35,000,000	57,600,000	47,600,000
85-D-103 Safeguards and security enhancements, LLNL and SNLL	16,000,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
85-D-106 Hardened engineering test bldg, LLNL	1,800,000	430,000	430,000
84-D-102 Radiation-hardened integrated circuit lab, SNLA	15,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
84-D-103 Hardened central guard force facility, LANL, NM	-700,000	---	---
84-D-104 Nuclear materials storage facility, LANL, NM	11,375,000	---	---
84-D-105 Safeguards and security upgrades, Phase I, LANL, NM	7,050,000	---	---
84-D-106 Security system upgrade, SNLA, NM	1,900,000	---	---
83-D-199 Buffer land acquisition, LLNL & SNLL	9,700,000	---	---
82-D-144 Simulation technology laboratory, SNLA	10,300,000	6,000,000	5,000,000
82-D-152 New detonator facility, LANL	-1,600,000	---	---
Prior year projects	-164,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	135,661,000	149,830,000	120,630,000
Subtotal, Research and development	1,015,434,000	1,239,900,000	1,155,400,000
B. Testing			
Operating expenses	501,358,000	633,800,000	570,400,000
Capital equipment	44,207,000	72,000,000	66,000,000
Construction:			
87-D-101 General plant projects, NTS	---	7,700,000	7,700,000
86-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	7,700,000	---	---
85-D-104 Test devices assembly buildings, LAN	-800,000	---	---
85-D-105 Combined device assembly fac, NTS, NV	7,000,000	14,000,000	10,000,000
84-D-107 Nuclear testing facilities revitalization, various locations	12,900,000	15,300,000	15,300,000
84-D-108 Safeguards and site security upgrade, NTS, NV	-5,400,000	---	---
Subtotal Construction	21,400,000	37,000,000	33,000,000
Subtotal, Testing	566,965,000	742,800,000	669,400,000
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,582,399,000	1,982,700,000	1,824,800,000

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
C. Production and surveillance			
Operating expenses	1,739,789,000	1,968,504,000	1,873,504,000
Capital equipment	125,300,000	132,000,000	132,000,000
Construction:			
87-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	28,700,000	32,000,000	30,000,000
87-D-122 SRAM II warhead production facility, various locations	---	5,000,000	2,000,000
87-D-123 Protective clothing decon facility, Rocky Flats, Golden, CO	---	500,000	500,000
87-D-127 ES&H Upgrade, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	---	2,400,000	2,400,000
87-D-130 Receiving and shipping facility, Pinellas Plant, St. Petersburg, FL	---	300,000	300,000
86-D-122 Structural upgrade of existing plutonium facilities, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	2,820,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
86-D-123 Environmental hazards elimination, various locations	7,240,000	18,300,000	15,300,000
86-D-124 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Phase II, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	1,880,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
86-D-125 Safeguards and site security upgrade Phase II, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	1,410,000	8,500,000	4,500,000
86-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement Savannah River, Aiken, SC	4,700,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
85-D-112 Enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	12,500,000	21,800,000	21,800,000
85-D-113 Plant power and steam dist system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	12,690,000	7,600,000	5,600,000
85-D-115 Renovate plutonium building utility systems, Rocky Flats, CO	16,640,000	14,500,000	14,500,000
85-D-121 Air and water pollution control facs, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	13,160,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
85-D-123 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	2,820,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
85-D-124 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	2,260,000	---	---
85-D-125 Tactical bomb production facilities, various locations	9,000,000	14,800,000	11,800,000
84-D-112 TRIDENT II warhead production facilities, various locations	60,700,000	14,500,000	10,000,000
84-D-113 Antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead prod facs, var locations	5,000,000	47,000,000	---
84-D-114 Consolidated nonnuclear manufacturing facility, Rocky Flats, CO	-2,280,000	---	---
84-D-115 Electrical system expansion, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	5,920,000	---	---
84-D-117 Inert assembly & test facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	5,080,000	---	---
84-D-118 High explosive subassembly facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	31,020,000	---	---
84-D-120 Explosive component test facility, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	7,710,000	---	---
84-D-124 Environmental improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	11,280,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
84-D-211 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	12,220,000	30,000,000	22,000,000
84-D-212 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pinellas Plant, FL	4,370,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
82-D-106 Weapon assembly facilities, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	-3,800,000	---	---
82-D-107 Utilities & equip restoration, replace & upgrade, Phase III, var locations	152,250,000	116,900,000	116,900,000
82-D-108 Nuclear weapons stockpile improvement, various locations	-800,000	---	---
82-D-109 155mm artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP) prod facs, var locations	15,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
82-D-111 Interactive graphics system, various locations	4,230,000	---	---
82-D-146 Weapons prod & prod support facs, various locations	-950,000	---	---
80-AE-5 Ground launched cruise missile warhead prod. facs., various locations	-1,000	---	---
80-AE-13 Pershing II airburst warhead production facilities, various locations	-8,000	---	---
79-7-N Utilities system restoration; Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	-279,000	---	---
79-7-P Facilities for a new modern strategic bomb, various locations	-26,000	---	---
78-16-A Cruise missile production facilities various, locations	-1,570,000	---	---
Prior year projects	-22,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	420,864,000	401,700,000	325,200,000
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	2,285,953,000	2,502,204,000	2,330,704,000
D. Program direction			
Operating expenses			
1. Weapons program	46,255,000	52,450,000	50,450,000
3. Community assistance	48,845,000	8,100,000	8,100,000
Subtotal, Program direction	95,100,000	60,550,000	58,550,000
Total, Weapons activities	3,963,452,000	4,545,454,000	4,214,054,000
(Operating expenses)	(3,133,198,000)	(3,643,554,000)	(3,427,854,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(830,254,000)	(901,900,000)	(786,200,000)
II. Inertial confinement fusion			
Operating expenses	137,868,000	109,000,000	145,000,000
Capital equipment	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,000,000
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	147,368,000	118,500,000	154,000,000

INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION

The Committee recommendation for Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) is $154,000,000 which includes a recommendation of $145,000,000 in operating expenses and $9,000,000 in capital equipment. The FY 1987 recommendation is $6,632,000 greater than the funding in FY 1986.

The Committee notes that the March 1986 review of the Department of Energy's Inertial Confinement Fusion program by the National Academy of Sciences was very supportive of the continuation of the program. The review recommended establishing the ICF program as a separate budget activity and the Committee recommendation provides for this.

The Committee is concerned that the level of operating funds proposed by this Administration would be significantly less than that required to make use of the large and expensive facilities recently constructed. These facilities have been expensive to build and offer great promise if the experimental activities are continued. The allocation of the operating funds is as follows:

Glass laser program	$89,000,000
Gas laser program	34,000,000
Pulsed power experiment	22,000,000
Total	145,000,000

Within the glass laser program, $67,200,000 is provided for the program at LLNL, $13,800,000 for the program at KMSF, and $8,000,000 for the program at the University of Rochester. Funding for the NRL should be obtained from within the totals available.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The Materials Production program provides nuclear materials to meet near-term national defense and non-defense requirements. In addition, Materials Production sustains a base production program capable of meeting long-term nuclear materials production requirements consistent with the annual Presidential Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum and the annual Department of Energy Materials Management Plan.

The Materials Production program operates a reactor feed material production complex, production reactors at Savannah River and Richland, spent fuel chemical processing plants at Savannah River, Richland, and Idaho, and support facilities. These facilities are unique to the production of nuclear materials for defense purposes.

The Committee has received extensive testimony concerning the safe operation of the Department of Energy's production reactors. The Committee has been repeatedly advised that no information coming from the recent accident of a Soviet reactor results in a decision that the Department's production reactors are unsafe. The Committee is aware of a number of independent assessments being conducted concerning the operation of the production reactors. The latest review requested by the Secretary of Energy requires an independent review by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. The Committee's recommenda-

tions support the continued operation of the Department's production reactors pending the completion of such reviews.

The Committee recommendation for Materials Production totals $1,912,746,000 of which $1,549,390,000 is for operating expenses and $363,356,000 is for plant and capital equipment. This reflects an increase of $144,597,000 over fiscal year 1986 levels and a decrease of $153,400,000 from the budget request.

The Materials Production program is organized into the following subcategories: Reactor Operations, Processing of Nuclear Reactor Operations, Processing of Nuclear Materials, Supporting Services, Enriched Material, and Equipment and Program Direction.

REACTOR OPERATIONS

The Committee recommendation for Reactor Operations totals $642,950,000 which reflects an increase of $62,012,000 compared to fiscal year 1986 and a decrease of $27,000,000 from the budget request.

The Committee recommendation for operating expenses reflects a $9,000,000 reduction to the budget request and allows for inflationary increases over the fiscal year 1986 funding.

The Committee recommendation does not include the funds requested to initiate construction of project 87-D-156, Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River. The Committee is not convinced that the proposed $100,000,000 cooling towers will provide any thermal protection off the Savannah River site.

The Committee recommendation also defers $13,000,000 in budget growth for projects 86-D-152 and 85-D-145. These reductions will result in delays of work to future years.

PROCESSING OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS

The Committee recommendation for processing of nuclear materials totals $543,190,000 which reflects a decrease of $21,000,000 from the Department's request.

The recommended funding for operating expenses is $489,830,000 which reflects a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request. This reduction is imposed by budgetary restraints and will result in delays of work to future years. $11,000,000 in budgeted increases in construction funds are deferred without prejudice until later fiscal years.

The Committee recommendations support the conclusion of the March 19, 1986, Special Isotope Separation (SIS) Process Readiness Review. The review concluded that the Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation (AVLIS) process is ready for definitive design as a precursor to commitment to physical construction. Accordingly, the budgeted $75,000,000 is available for the AVLIS Process.

SUPPORTING SERVICES

The Committee recommendation for Supporting Services totals $403,116,000 which reflects an increase of $15,147,000 compared to fiscal year 1986 and a decrease of $75,400,000 from the Administration budget request.

Because of budget restraints, the Committee recommendation reflects a deferral of $65,400,000 in construction costs to future years.

ENRICHED MATERIAL

The Committee recommends $187,500,000 for Enriched Materials which represents $17,000,000 reduction from the budget request. The recommendation reflects a reduction of highly enriched uranium used for fabrication of reactor cores used in naval reactor plants. This reduction will delay the full operation of the new fuel facility constructed at Savannah River.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT AND PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation provides $114,090,000 for capital equipment which provides for inflationary increases over fiscal year 1986. Program direction is funded at $21,900,000.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
III. Materials production			
A. Reactor operations			
Operating expenses	541,098,000	616,660,000	607,660,000
Construction:			
87-D-155 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC	---	5,000,000	---
86-D-150 In-core neutron monitoring system N-Reactor, Richland, WA	5,130,000	2,090,000	2,090,000
86-D-152 Reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	2,710,000	7,700,000	4,700,000
85-D-145 Fuel production facility, Savannah River, SC	18,000,000	35,500,000	25,500,000
84-D-136 Enriched uranium conversion facility modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	12,200,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
82-D-126 Reactor safety and reliability, various locations	1,800,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	39,840,000	53,290,000	35,290,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations	580,938,000	669,950,000	642,950,000
B. Processing of nuclear materials			
Operating expenses	464,832,000	499,830,000	489,830,000
Construction:			
86-D-148 SIS plant (design only), Richland, WA	3,805,000	---	---
86-D-151 PUREX electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	2,380,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
86-D-153 Additional line III tritium furnace, Savannah River, SC	1,805,000	7,300,000	5,300,000
86-D-154 Effluent treatment facility, Savannah River, SC	2,500,000	15,650,000	11,650,000
86-D-157 Hydrofluorination system, FB-Line, Savannah River, SC	2,000,000	2,510,000	2,510,000
85-D-137 Vault safety SNM inventory system, Richland, WA	1,900,000	---	---
84-D-135 Process facility modifications, Richland, WA	14,475,000	35,000,000	30,000,000
82-D-201 Special plutonium recovery facs, JB Line, Savannah River, SC	4,400,000	---	---
81-D-126 Pollution abatement facilities-chemical processing plants, Richland, WA	-233,000	---	---
Prior year projects	-38,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	32,994,000	64,360,000	53,360,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials	497,826,000	564,190,000	543,190,000

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
C. Supporting services			
Operating expenses	249,946,000	252,500,000	242,500,000
Construction:			
87-D-146 General plant projects, various locations	31,945,000	35,980,000	33,980,000
87-D-149 Reduced chemical discharges to process sewers, Richland, WA	---	3,150,000	3,150,000
87-D-150 Radioactive liquid effluent treatment facility, partial design only, Richland, WA	---	4,000,000	4,000,000
87-D-152 Environmental protection plantwide, Savannah River, SC	---	1,500,000	1,500,000
87-D-159 FMPC Environmental upgrade, Oak Ridge, TN	---	10,000,000	10,000,000
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phase I, various locations	19,600,000	76,225,000	43,225,000
86-D-156 Plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, SC	2,710,000	13,900,000	6,000,000
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, IFPF, INEL, ID	13,530,000	35,000,000	18,000,000
85-D-140 Productivity and radiological improvements, FMPC, Fernald, OH	15,000,000	23,500,000	21,000,000
84-D-134 Safeguards and security improvements Plant-wide, Savannah River, SC	6,315,000	14,650,000	11,650,000
84-D-137 Facility security systems upgrade, IFPF, INEL, ID	4,700,000	300,000	300,000
83-D-138 Purex canyon & dissolver filter systems improvements, Richland, WA	-767,000	---	---
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	7,750,000	---	---
82-D-124 Restoration of production capabilities, Phase II, III, IV, & V, var locs	39,600,000	7,811,000	7,811,000
Prior year projects	-2,370,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	138,023,000	226,016,000	160,616,000
Subtotal, Supporting services	387,969,000	478,516,000	403,116,000
D. Enriched material	169,600,000	204,500,000	187,500,000
E. Capital equipment	109,540,000	126,090,000	114,090,000
F. Program direction	22,276,000	22,900,000	21,900,000
Subtotal, Materials production	1,768,149,000	2,066,146,000	1,912,746,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,447,752,000)	(1,596,390,000)	(1,549,390,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(320,397,000)	(469,756,000)	(363,356,000)

DEFENSE WASTE AND BYPRODUCT MANAGEMENT

The defense nuclear waste management program includes near-term and longer term activities to assure that existing and future nuclear waste from Federal Government program activities can be isolated from the biosphere and pose no significant threat to public health and safety. For the near term, the wastes are managed through interim storage facilities with a high degree of integrity. Simultaneous efforts are proceeding on development of technology and processes for long-term disposal.

The Committee recommendation for defense waste and byproduct management totals $644,600,000 which reflects an increase of $26,176,000 compared to fiscal year 1986, and a decrease of $59,800,000 from the Administration's budget request.

The Committee recommendation for operating expenses is $412,050,000 and can accommodate the urgent requirements of the program. In addition, the funding for general plant projects has been reduced by $1,000,000 which will require the deferral of some activities to future years.

$16,800,000 in plant and capital equipment funding is deferred to future years because of budget restraints.

The Committee is concerned with the continued disposal of contaminated liquids into soil at the Hanford site. In particular, the Committee notes the Department's request for $1,600,000 for the construction of two additional facilities of this type. The Committee recognizes the need to replace existing facilities that are reaching the end of their useful lifetime. However, the Department is directed to provide a plan within 120 days of enactment of this legislation, which presents technically available options for ceasing this practice, including costs, and a proposed implementation schedule. The report should also provide a schedule for compliance with all applicable environmental laws and regulations.

WASTE TREATMENT PROGRAM

The Department has invested substantial funds to develop a waste solidification treatment center which has developed the solidification process for the Savannah River and the West Valley wastes and is now developing the process for the Hanford defense wastes. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to continue the operation of this ceramic melter.

The Committee recommendation also includes $12,000,000 in design funds to maintain the current schedule for the development of a Vitrification Plant for the Hanford Plant.

The Committee recommendation includes $3,300,000 to support the development of the TRUEX solvent extraction process developed at Argonne National Laboratory; $800,000 will support laboratory studies and $2,500,000 is needed to conduct hot-cell demonstrations.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
IV. Defense waste and byproducts management			
A. Interim waste management			
Operating expenses	262,221,000	324,730,000	288,730,000
Construction:			
87-D-171 General plant projects, various locations	23,453,000	26,535,000	25,535,000
87-D-172 WESF K-3 Filter upgrade, Richland, WA	---	500,000	500,000
87-D-173 242-A Evaporator/crystallizer upgrade, Richland, WA	---	2,800,000	2,000,000
87-D-174 241-AQ Tank farm, Richland, WA	---	2,100,000	2,100,000
87-D-175 Steam Transfer Line, RL	---	900,000	900,000
87-D-177 TRA Liquid radioactive waste clean-up, phase III, INEL, Idaho	---	700,000	700,000
87-D-180 Burial ground expansion, Savannah River, SC	---	6,300,000	4,300,000
87-D-181 Tank farm containment buildings, Savannah River, SC	---	1,360,000	1,360,000
86-D-172 B-Plant F-Filter, Richland, WA	949,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
86-D-173 Central waste disposal facility, Oak Ridge, TN	949,000	---	---
86-D-174 Low-level waste processing and shipping system, FMPC, Fernald, OH	2,372,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
86-D-175 Security upgrade, ID	1,958,000	7,300,000	5,300,000
85-D-157 Seventh calcined solids storage facility, INEL, ID	13,319,000	800,000	800,000
85-D-158 Central warehouse upgrade, Richland, WA	4,744,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
85-D-159 New waste transfer facilities H-Area, Savannah River, SC	8,118,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
85-D-160 TRA security system upgrade, INEL, ID	2,203,000	2,750,000	2,750,000
82-N-103 Waste handling & isolation facs, Richland, WA	2,069,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
82-N-107 Rail replacement/Hanford railroad, Richland, WA	-400,000	---	---
81-T-103 Sixth set of calcined solids storage bins, ICPP, INEL, ID	-225,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	59,509,000	76,545,000	70,745,000
Subtotal, Interim waste management	321,730,000	401,275,000	359,475,000
B. Long-term waste management technology			
Operating expenses	89,773,000	88,820,000	88,820,000
Construction:			
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC	155,400,000	135,000,000	125,000,000
Subtotal, Long-term waste management technology	245,173,000	223,820,000	213,820,000
C. Terminal storage			
Operating expenses	23,982,000	39,100,000	32,100,000
Construction:			
77-13-F Waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, Southeast, NM	-8,600,000	---	---
Subtotal, Terminal storage	15,382,000	39,100,000	32,100,000
D. Capital equipment	33,769,000	37,805,000	36,805,000
E. Program direction	2,370,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Subtotal, Defense waste & by-products management	618,424,000	704,400,000	644,600,000
(Operating expenses)	(378,346,000)	(455,050,000)	(412,050,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(240,078,000)	(249,350,000)	(232,550,000)

OTHER ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Included in this category are these principal subprograms:

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

This program provides for the research, development, test, and support activities related to the detection of nuclear test activities in response to treaty verification and national security requirements; analysis and support for nuclear intelligence, export control and arms control issues; and the review of export licenses applications as required by the Atomic Energy Act as amended, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 and the Export Administration Act of 1979.

The Committee recommendation includes an allowance of $90,700,000 which will provide for the highest priorities of the program.

NUCLEAR MATERIALS SECURITY AND SAFEGUARDS DEVELOPMENT

This program includes activities to assure adequate protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, facilities, and classified information against theft and sabotage. The program also focuses on providing safeguards technical support to United States and international activities designed to minimize the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The funds included in the Committee recommendation of $59,900,000 should provide for the highest priority activities.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

This program includes those activities necessary for the granting of appropriate security clearances to agency and Government contractor personnel who must in the performance of their work, have access to Restricted Data, National Security Information, or special nuclear material, or who occupy a designated critical sensitive position.

The Committee recommendation is equal to the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
V. All Other			
A. Verification and control technology			
Operating expenses	84,201,000	95,500,000	86,500,000
Capital equipment	5,600,000	4,200,000	2,200,000
Construction:			
85-D-171 Space science laboratory, LANL, NM	4,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	94,301,000	101,700,000	90,700,000
B. Nuclear safeguards and security			
Operating expenses	52,598,000	61,100,000	54,100,000
Capital equipment	4,455,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
Construction:			
86-D-186 Nuclear safeguards technology lab, LANL, NM	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal Nuclear safeguards and security	57,053,000	66,900,000	59,900,000
VI. Security investigations - OE	32,200,000	33,300,000	33,300,000
Subtotal, All Other	183,554,000	201,900,000	183,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(168,999,000)	(189,900,000)	(173,900,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(14,555,000)	(12,000,000)	(10,000,000)

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Naval Reactors Development Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores having long fuel life, high reliability, improved performances, and simplified operating and maintenance requirements. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships.

The Committee recommendation includes $584,600,000 for the Naval Reactor Development program which reflects a reduction of $5,000,000 of capital equipment funds and $4,000,000 in reactor operations and evaluation. This will require the deferral of some activities to future years.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
VII Naval reactors development			
A. Plant development			
Operating expenses	62,500,000	71,000,000	71,000,000
B. Reactor development			
Operating expenses	251,700,000	274,000,000	274,000,000
Construction:			
87-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	3,770,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
87-N-102 Kesselring site facilities upgrade, KAPL, Schnectady, NY	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
87-N-103 Computation laboratory addition, Bettis, Pittsburg, PA	---	2,300,000	2,300,000
85-N-104 Reactor modifications, ATR, INEL, ID	4,500,000	---	---
83-N-111 Materials facility, Savannah River, SC	11,000,000	---	---
81-T-112 Mods. and additions to prototype fcils, various locations	27,000,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	46,270,000	12,100,000	12,100,000
Subtotal, Reactor development	297,970,000	286,100,000	286,100,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation			
Operating expenses	139,000,000	173,000,000	169,000,000
E. Capital equipment	25,300,000	51,700,000	46,700,000
F. Program direction	10,923,000	11,800,000	11,800,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	535,693,000	593,600,000	584,600,000
(Operating expenses)	(464,123,000)	(529,800,000)	(535,800,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(71,570,000)	(63,800,000)	(58,800,000)
Adjustments:			
Addback of G-R-H reductions against balances	7,157,000	---	---
Addback of proposed transfer for ES&H - (ESH) ESRD	8,617,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reduction - (DP) AEDA	2,084,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reduction - (ME) AEDA	166,000	---	---
Total, Adjustments	18,024,000	---	---
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	7,231,684,000	8,230,000,000	7,693,900,000
(Operating expenses)	($5,738,153,000)	($6,523,694,000)	($6,233,394,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(1,493,511,000)	(1,706,306,000)	(1,459,906,000)

Departmental Administration

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$150,319,000
Budget estimate, 1987	151,082,000
Recommended, 1987	145,663,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−4,656,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−5,419,000

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	384,606,000
Budget estimate, 1987	395,116,000
Recommended, 1987	389,697,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+5,091,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−5,419,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	9,941,000
Budget estimate, 1987	7,913,000
Recommended, 1987	7,913,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−2,028,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	−244,228,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−251,947,000
Recommended, 1987	−251,947,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−7,719,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The appropriations recommended for Departmental Administration provide for the Office of the Secretary and the Deparment's general management, administrative and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provided for (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the institutional relations program that provides information services and other activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, and support for energy training and education; (4) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (5) revenues from the sale of DOE productions and services and their related costs.

The Committee recommendation includes $3,187,000 for the Office of Minority Economic Impact which represents an increase of $1,581,000 compared to the Administration request. This recommendation would continue the Minority Honors Training program at the current level of $402,000 and with the funding deferred from FY 1986, a Minority Institution Education Assistance Program of $1,683,000.

The Committee recommendation includes the Administration request for the Office of Inspector General which is not available for reprogrammings without the specific approval of the appropriate

Congressional committees. The Committee recommends a reduction of $1,000,000 for International Affairs. The Committee is concerned that there appears to be considerable duplication between the activities of this program and the individual technologies.

The Committee is concerned with the large amount of foreign travel expenses incurred by the Department and its laboratory personnel. The Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $1,000,000 in foreign travel expenses. The Department should distribute this reduction to the appropriate accounts under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Bill using the transfer authority provided. Similarly, the Department should distribute a $5,000,000 reduction in the public affairs and legislative affairs funds included in the accounts funded under this bill. The Committee recommendation also establishes a ceiling of $17,500 for official reception and representation expenses funded under the Departmental Administration account.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

Department of Energy

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
I. Office of the Secretary - Salaries and expenses			
A. Office of the Secretary	1,148,000	1,353,000	1,353,000
B. Other expenses	455,000	507,000	507,000
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary	1,603,000	1,860,000	1,860,000
II. General management - salaries			
A. Board of Contract Appeals	291,000	269,000	269,000
B. General Counsel	7,172,000	7,413,000	7,413,000
C. Inspector General	7,153,000	7,720,000	7,720,000
D. A/S Management & Administration	37,712,000	39,845,000	39,845,000
E. A/S Cong., Intergov. & Public Affairs	3,588,000	3,689,000	3,689,000
F. Operations Offices	54,395,000	57,323,000	57,323,000
G. Policy, Planning & Analysis	2,658,000	2,763,000	2,763,000
H. A/S International Affairs	2,479,000	2,832,000	2,832,000
I. Office of Minority Economic Impact	445,000	406,000	406,000
Subtotal, Salaries	115,893,000	122,260,000	122,260,000
III. General management - other expenses			
A. Other salary expenses	7,335,000	6,369,000	6,369,000
B. Benefits	12,967,000	18,842,000	18,842,000
C. Travel	3,776,000	5,775,000	5,775,000
D. Services	99,010,000	117,054,000	117,054,000
E. Workmens compensation	1,382,000	---	---
F. Capital equipment	9,941,000	7,913,000	7,913,000
Subtotal, Other expenses	134,411,000	155,953,000	155,953,000
IV. Program Support			
A. Policy analysis and system studies	4,243,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
B. Indian Affairs	289,000	200,000	200,000
C. Consumer Affairs	76,000	50,000	50,000
D. Public Affairs	415,000	206,000	206,000
E. Competition	96,000	50,000	50,000
F. International Policy Studies	963,000	1,700,000	700,000
G. Office of Minority Economic Impact	2,066,000	1,200,000	2,781,000
H. Cost of work for others	143,543,000	115,050,000	115,050,000
Subtotal, Program support	151,691,000	122,956,000	123,537,000
V. Miscellaneous revenues	-244,228,000	-251,947,000	-251,947,000
Use of ESRD balances - (PPA) DA	-108,000	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (IA) DA	-108,000	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (MA) DA	-4,279,000	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (GC) DA	-325,000	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (BCA) DA	-27,000	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (OSEC) DA	-54,000	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (IG) DA	-325,000	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (CP) DA	-162,000	---	---
Use of ESRD balances - (OMEI) DA	-27,000	---	---
Addback of proposed FTE reduction - (MA)	-3,636,000	---	---
Foreign travel reduction	---	---	-1,000,000
Public and Legislative Affairs	---	---	-5,000,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	150,319,000	151,082,000	145,663,000
(Operating expenses)	(384,606,000)	(395,116,000)	(389,697,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(9,941,000)	(7,913,000)	(7,913,000)
(Miscellaneous revenues)	(-244,228,000)	(-251,947,000)	(-251,947,000)

Power Marketing Activities

Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

All power marketing administrations except Bonneville are funded annually with appropriations and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury. Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–454). The Act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, maintenance and capital construction, and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements.

PRIVATIZATION OF POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

The Administration has indicated its intention to propose legislation to sell the five Power Marketing Administrations. The Committee has received testimony from the Administration that the Power Marketing Administrations would not be sold without the enactment of enabling legislation.

The Committee has in the past supported efforts to sell the Alaska Power Marketing Administration to the State of Alaska. However, the Committee has received considerable testimony and letters in opposition to the sale of the other Power Marketing Administrations and the Administration has been unable to state how the sale of the PMAs would be in the public interest.

The FY 1986 Urgent Supplemental Appropriation bill contains a legislative prohibition that would suspend action on the sale of the Power Marketing Administrations and TVA until Congress has had an opportunity to determine whether the privatization idea is worth pursuing. This suspension will preclude the damage to morale of the PMA and TVA employees because of uncertainty as to their future as Federal employees and will enable the Power Marketing Administrations and TVA to make long-range plans without the uncertainty of their future. The Committee reiterates its support of the provision contained in the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act.

RATE REFORM

The Administration has proposed changes in FY 1987 that would provide for a significant increase in the rates charged by the Power Marketing Administrations. The Committee has historically been a strong supporter of fiscal responsibility by the Power Marketing Administrations. The Committee has supported and encouraged the significant progress of Bonneville in bringing costs under control and setting a foundation for rate stability.

The Committee is concerned, however, that proposed rate reform would have significant adverse impact on the economic health of the regions supported by the Power Marketing Administrations and would result in less repayments to the Federal Government because of the loss of significant energy-intensive industries in the regions. The Committee has included bill language in the past preventing a change from a cost base to market base for PMA rates. This language was intended to prevent a unilateral change in the terms of agreement that were made years ago between the Federal Government and the regions served by the PMA's.

The Committee has been assured that the Administration will make no changes in the rate development process administratively. The Committee therefore directs that the rate structure not be modified without the enactment of appropriate legislation.

The following table summarizes the appropriation recommended for the Power Marketing Administrations:

61-313 O - 86 - 5

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
Power marketing - Alaska Power Administration			
Operating expenses	3,245,000	3,281,000	3,281,000
Use of prior year balances	---	-400,000	-400,000
TOTAL ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,245,000	2,881,000	2,881,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION			
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(10,000,000)
TOTAL BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(10,000,000)
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
Power marketing - Southeastern power administration			
A. Operating and maintenance	1,856,000	2,031,000	2,031,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	12,879,000	19,705,000	19,705,000
Use of prior year balances	-14,735,000	-2,089,000	-2,089,000
TOTAL SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	---	19,647,000	19,647,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
Power marketing - Southwestern Power Administration			
A. Operation and maintenance	10,874,000	11,802,000	11,802,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	21,624,000	20,959,000	20,959,000
C. Construction	5,456,000	5,819,000	5,819,000
Use of prior year balances	-8,774,000	-13,243,000	-13,243,000
Addback of proposed FTE reductions	11,000	---	---
TOTAL SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,191,000	25,337,000	25,337,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
Power marketing - Western Area Power Administration			
A. Construction and rehabilitation	79,165,000	83,275,000	83,275,000
B. System operation and maintenance	74,477,000	86,100,000	86,100,000
C. Purchase power and wheeling	72,500,000	114,400,000	114,400,000
Unobligated balances	-30,300,000	-43,466,000	-43,466,000
Addback of proposed FTE reductions	68,000	---	---
Less amount by transfer, permanent authority	-890,000	-3,463,000	-3,463,000
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	195,020,000	236,846,000	236,846,000

Power Marketing Administrations

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$3,245,000
Budget estimate, 1987	2,881,000
Recommended, 1987	2,881,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−364,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and power marketing of two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska. The operating projects are the 30,000 kW Eklutna Project near Anchorage and the 47,160 kW Snettisham Project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission systems and necessary maintenance facilities. Power is marketed at wholesale to five Alaskan utilities. The projects represent a current Federal investment of $131,000,000 and a replacement value in excess of $250,000,000.

The Administration's FY 1987 budget assumes that the Alaska Power Administration programs and facilities will not be transferred to the State of Alaska during FY 1987, however, the transfer, which will require both Federal and state authorizing legislation, is continuing to be pursued.

The Committee continues to support the transfer and recommends funding the Alaska Power Administration in FY 1987 at the requested level.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	($20,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1987	(20,000,000)
Recommended, 1987	(10,000,000)
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	(−10,000)
Budget estimate, 1987	(−10,000)

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. BPA markets hydroelectric power from 30 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. BPA also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA constructs, operates and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system (14,451 circuit-miles of transmission line and 385 substations at the end of fiscal year 1987).

Public Law 93-454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974 placed BPA on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96-501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, BPA's responsibilities

were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, and to invest in cost-effective, regionwide energy conservation and to acquire generating resources to meet these requirements.

FISH ENHANCEMENT FACILITIES

The Committee recommends approval of the Administration proposal to construct a fish passage facility on the Enloe Dam. The project will provide access for anadromous salmonids to over 350 miles of spawning and rearing habitat in the upper Similkameen River watershed.

CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The Committee is concerned that the FY 1987 conservation program of BPA has been reduced by $21.7 million. This level would jeopardize the viability of conservation programs within the Bonneville service area. Therefore, the Committee has provided borrowing resources to the Administrator to allow BPA to finance the conservation program at a level of $139,200,000. The Committee has been advised that the rate base was established at a level that would support this level of conservation. The BPA borrowing authority is adjusted accordingly.

BORROWING AUTHORITY

A total of $3.75 billion has been made available to BPA as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts BPA plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on Bonneville's borrowing requirements. In addition to the cumulative $2.304 billion available to BPA through FY 1986, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $297.8 million in borrowing authority in FY 1987 for the construction, conservation, and fish and wildlife programs for a total of $2.602 billion, including any unused portion from prior years.

REPAYMENT

The Committee is pleased with the continuing efforts of BPA to improve the fiscal condition of the Administration. In FY 1985, BPA paid the U.S. Treasury approximately $686,000,000, including $237,000,000 for amortization. At the end of FY 1985, BPA was current in its payments of interest and amortization to the Treasury.

LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS

The recommended limitation on direct loans is $10,000,000 which is adequate for BPA to carry out its responsibilities as required by law.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	
Budget estimate, 1987	$19,647,000
Recommended, 1987	19,647,000

Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+19,647,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The Southeastern Power Administration (SEPA) markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers construction projects in 10 southeastern States. There are 22 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092,375 kilowatts.

Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through "wheeling" arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The FY 1986 budget request and appropriation was reduced to zero by applying unobligated balances from FY 1984 and FY 1985. The Committee recommends the FY 1987 budget request of $19,647,000 which provides for the continuation of the basic power marketing program without new program initiatives.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$29,191,000
Budget estimate, 1987	25,337,000
Recommended, 1987	25,337,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−3,854,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The Southwestern Power Administration (SWPA) is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana with a total installed capacity of 2,150,000 kilowatts. It operates and maintains some 1,390 miles of transmission lines, 23 generating projects, 26 substations, and 20 radio and microwave stations and sells its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

INVESTMENT AND REPAYMENT

As of the end of fiscal year 1985, the cumulative Federal investment in SWPA projects total $839,100,000. Of this, $101,600,000 has been repaid to the Treasury plus interest totaling $375,600,000 leaving an unpaid investment of $737,500,000.

REQUIREMENTS

The decrease in appropriations for fiscal year 1987 compared to fiscal year 1986 is primarily the result of the availability of unobligated appropriation from fiscal year 1986.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$195,020,000
Budget estimate, 1987	236,846,000
Recommended, 1987	236,846,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+41,826,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) is responsible for marketing electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission which operate hydropower generating plants in 15 central and western States encompassing a 1.3 million square-mile geographic area. WAPA is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of about 16,000 miles of high voltage transmission lines with over 242 substations. WAPA distributes power generated by 52 plants with an installed capacity of 8,865 megawatts.

WAPA, through its power marketing program must secure revenues sufficient to meet the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the generating and transmission facilities, purchased power, wheeling and other expenses, in order to repay all of the power investment with interest, and to repay that portion of the Government's irrigation and other nonpower investments which are beyond the water users' repayment capability. Under the Colorado River Basins Power Marketing Fund, which encompasses the Colorado River Basin, Fort Peck, and Colorado River Storage Facilities, all operation and maintenance and power marketing expenses are financed from revenues.

INVESTMENT AND REPAYMENT

As of the end of fiscal year 1985, the cumulative Federal investment in WAPA projects total $4,148,000,000. Of this, $1,760,000,000 has been repaid to the Treasury plus interest totaling $1,250,000,000 leaving an unpaid investment of $2,388,000,000.

REQUIREMENTS

WAPA funding requirements are based on an increase in purchase power and wheeling offset by an estimated $43,538,000 in unobligated balances from FY 1986. These unobligated balances result from unusually high water levels in the region during FY 1986.

TRACEY-LIVERMORE INTERTIE

The Committee has been advised that significant savings in operating costs at the DOE laboratories could be realized with a reliable, relatively short, direct connection to WAPA's transmission system. Therefore, within the limit of available funding and at an estimated cost of $18,900,000, WAPA is directed to proceed with completion of such facilities. WAPA shall recover the actual costs of construction, including interest, by establishing a special cost component to be added to the rates charged for Central Valley Project power sold to the DOE laboratories. These facilities are not to be used by or expanded by or for any other entity other than the

Department of Energy laboratories without the specific prior approval of Congress.

No such facilities shall be constructed for electric transmission or distribution service which the Secretary determines, on the basis of an offer of a firm fifty-year contract from a local, public, or private agency, can, through such contract, be obtained at less cost to the Federal Government than by construction and operation of Government facilities.

COLORADO RIVER DAM FUND

The Committee recommends bill language as requested by the Administration to implement the provisions of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$91,459,000
Budget estimate, 1987	99,079,000
Recommended, 1987	99,079,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+7,620,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

REVENUES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	−49,470,000
Budget estimate, 1987	−78,754,000
Recommended, 1987	−78,754,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−29,284,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	41,989,000
Budget estimate, 1987	20,325,000
Recommended, 1987	20,325,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−21,754,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The fiscal year 1987 Administration request for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) provides for a program level of $99,079,000 of which $78,754,000 would be derived from user fee revenues and $20,325,000 would be new budget (obligational) authority.

The Committee anticipates that the Commission will increase its efforts to raise revenues in order to offset the need for appropriations. Although the Committee recognizes that pending court cases may affect the ability of FERC to increase fee-derived revenues, it is incumbent upon the Commission to take every step possible to reduce the deficit through more diligent billing of licenses.

Geothermal Resources Development Fund

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$69,000
Budget estimate, 1987	72,000
Recommended, 1987	72,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+3,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The Geothermal Resources Development Fund was established to accelerate the development and utilization of geothermal energy through loan guarantees which facilitate private credit to geothermal projects. The Committee recommendation is the same as the budget request.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Appropriation adjusted, 1996	$114,343,000
Budget estimate, 1997	
Recommended, 1997	100,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−14,343,000
Budget estimate, 1997	+100,000,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency that represents a partnership of Federal, State and local government. Established in 1965, it is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian States and a Federal Cochairman who is appointed by the President. Local participation in the Commission program involves multicounty local development districts with boards consisting of elected officials, businessmen and other local leaders.

Annually, Congress appropriates funds for highways and area development programs, the latter providing support for community facilities, health, education, housing, energy and other essentials to economic development. Appalachian Governors, in consultation with local development districts, draw up annual Appalachian development programs and select for ARC approval projects to implement these programs.

The legislation establishing ARC defines Appalachia as including 397 counties in 13 Appalachian States, with a population of over 20 million people.

The fiscal year 1997 recommendation of $100,000,000 is provided in a single appropriation account. No existing authorities are changed by this consolidation.

The appropriation finances the full cost of the Office of the Federal Cochairperson and 50 percent of the administrative expenses of the Commission. The recommendation provides for a personnel level in 1997 sufficient to administer ARC programs.

The Committee understands the Commission will continue to carry out programs for development highways and local access roads, stimulation of jobs and private investment, distressed counties, and local development districts, and will allocate FY 1997 funds for the highway and other regional development programs in approximately the same proportions as FY 1996. The Committee encourages the ARC to continue health and human services programs to address special regional problems such as high rates of infant mortality and school dropouts and the problems inhibiting medical services by smaller hospitals and clinics. The Commission should also continue to encourage the use and shipment of Appalachian coal.

Improving and expanding job preparation training and education attainment are critical to the economic future of Appalachia. Without educated, dependable, and responsive people the promise of a growing dynamic future cannot be sustained. Funds provided for the Job Preparation/Dropout Reduction program will enable the Appalachian Foundation to demonstrate in rural Appalachia the effectiveness of job preparation and dropout reduciton programs that have been effective in urban areas. Demonstration projects will be established in up to six separate sites within the Appalachian Region to prepare "at-risk" high school students for a successful transition to the working environment. Depending on local conditions, support, and need, and an assessment by the Appalachian Foundation of these factors, projects will include: training in the skills necessary to successfully identify, obtain, and hold a productive job within the community; and, educational, motivational, and support services to help these at-risk students complete high school graduation requirements.

The Committee recommendation would continue ongoing, essential programs in Appalachia for the purpose of completion of commitments made by the Federal Government to the region. The Committee does not agree with the premise that economic and community development programs in disadvantaged regions of the country have served their purpose and exist merely to meet local needs. The interests of each State region and locality is of concern and importance to the national interest, and continuation of the Appalachian Regional Commission serves the national interests and acts as a model of Federal/State cooperation. Furthermore, although much has been accomplished in Appalachia as a result of the ARC program, much remains to be done to equalize the region with the rest of the country.

The nature of the Appalachian program has changed as well. As the ability of the Appalachian states to contribute financially to economic and community development projects has improved, so has the matching requirement that the Appalachian states have imposed on themselves. From an original 80% Federal share in all ARC programs, the Appalachian governors now operate on a 50/50 cost share arrangement in all but the most distressed counties and unusual circumstances. This is particularly noteworthy in light of the limited tax base available to the Appalachian states and counties. Additionally, the Appalachian program in recent years has focused on only the highest priorities and needs of the region. Continuation of a reduced-scope highway program with emphasis on critical economic development arteries has reduced the long-term costs of that activity while enhancing the benefits derived from it. Emphasis on distressed counties directs funding at the neediest of the region's people for delivery of health services and other basic needs. Improvement of the participation of the private sector improves the long-term ability of the region to progress to genuine independence with an ability to sustain economic growth.

It is with the long-term benefit of the region and the Nation that the Committee recommends continuation of the Appalachian Regional Commission during the period until economic parity with the rest of the Nation can be achieved. This, along with the desire to create a viable tax base, private sector support system and pro-

vide essential public services as roads, transportation, health care and educational and vocational opportunity, is the Committee's basis for continuation through completion of the major elements of the Appalachian Regional Development Program.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$161,000
Budget estimate, 1987	185,000
Recommended, 1987	185,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+24,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The Delaware River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 87-328) among the States of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Federal Government.

The compact enables the Commission to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries.

This appropriation provides for the expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$263,000
Budget estimate, 1987	200,000
Recommended, 1987	289,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+26,000
Budget estimate, 1987	+89,000

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. $289,000 is recommended as the Federal contribution to the Commission's $2,110,200 current expense budget for 1987.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$79,000
Budget estimate, 1987	
Recommended, 1987	79,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	
Budget estimate, 1987	+79,000

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the four States in the basin, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, plus the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

The Commission has the responsibility for Basinwide water quality planning, program coordination and assistance.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$400,026,000
Budget estimate, 1987	405,000,000
Recommended, 1987	405,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+4,974,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

The Committee recommendation provides for an appropriation of $405,000,000 in fiscal year 1987, an increase of $4,974,000 compared to fiscal year 1986 and the same as the request.

MANAGEMENT

The Committee is encouraged by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission efforts to improve the management of the Commission. These include efforts to reduce duplicative and redundant staffs, review with the intent to simplify the overly restrictive application of ex parte and separation of functions rules and modifying its overly restrictive interpretation of the Sunshine Act.

BACKFITTING

The Committee supports the NRC actions on approving an improved Backfitting rule. The Committee continues to be concerned that the revised rule is understood and properly implemented. The Commission should aggressively pursue the implementation of the rule.

NUCLEAR TRAINING

The Committee understands that the NRC is in the process of formulating revisions to its rules on training requirements for the medical use of isotopes. The Committee is satisfied with the progress achieved on this matter and looks forward to its final resolution.

STANDARD DESIGNS

The Committee continues to urge the NRC to place high priority on the development of a process to approve standard designs. The Committee feels that the standard design concept, when fully implemented, would provide for a safe and cost-efficient design process by focusing the resource of designers, engineers and vendors on a limited number of approved designs. The Committee has received testimony indicating that approved standard designs would have a dramatic effect on reducing delays in both construction and licensing of new nuclear powerplants. The Committee urges the NRC to work with the industry efforts to develop a standard plant design.

INTEGRATED SAFETY ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (ISAP)

The Committee strongly supports the continuation of the program for Integrated Safety Assessment.

ADVANCED LIGHT WATER REACTORS

The NRC's Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation should provide the necessary staff and technical assistance to conduct preliminary reviews of vendor developed designs for Advanced Light Water Reactors. Such reviews should determine the relative strengths and weaknesses of such designs with respect to existing generation of plants.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$156,000
Budget estimate, 1987	179,000
Recommended, 1987	179,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	
Budget estimate, 1987	+23,000

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91-575) among the States of Maryland and New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries.

This appropriation provides for the expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff.

CONTRIBUTION TO SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$220,000
Budget estimate, 1987	240,000
Recommended, 1987	240,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	+20,000
Budget estimate, 1987	

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. The amount recommended for the Federal contribution is $240,000 of a current expense budget for 1987 of $1,522,500.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriation adjusted, 1986	$108,528,000
Budget estimate, 1987	58,038,000
Recommended, 1987	100,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1986	−8,528,00
Budget estimate, 1987	+41,962,000

The Committee recommendation for the Tennessee Valley Authority totals $100,000,000 and is an increase of $41,962,000 over the President's budget request. The explanation of the changes to the President's budget are as follows:

61-313 O - 86 - 6

The budget request for FY 1987 again eliminates all TVA economic and community development programs and most natural resource activities. Funding for the National Fertilizer Development Center is reduced and operation of water resource programs are reduced or eliminated. The consequence of this recommendation would be to eliminate many jobs from the Tennessee Valley Authority, and many more jobs from the economy and eliminate programs that cannot be carried out by State or local governments that are essential for the protection of natural resources, improvement of economic conditions and continuation of growth of the region.

The Committee recommendation includes a provision that authorizes the TVA Inspector General to subpoena documents. This power is an important investigative tool that could be used in connection with any audit, investigation, or inquiry that the TVA Inspector General might undertake in the performance of his duties and responsibilities. Under this provision, a subpoena could be signed by the Inspector General.

The Committee has also made permanent a provision applying to payments to physicians that has been carried in annual appropriation acts for many years.

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1986 estimate	1987 President's request	1987 allowed
Capital investment			
New lock at Pickwick Landing Dam	709		
Columbia Dam and Reservoir	863		
Dam safety modifications	5,857	2,610	2,400
Additions and improvements	3,864	1,500	1,790
Land and forest resources	240		200
Land Between The Lakes facilities	196		90
Fertilizer test facilities	5,191	4,400	4,350
North Alabama coal-to-methanol project	1,935		
General facilities	2,278	1,333	1,670
Total capital investment	21,043	9,843	10,500
Operating expenses			
Natural resources:			
Water resources	8,053	3,500	7,300
Reservoir system operations	22,771	20,593	21,800
Land and forest resources	4,130	550	3,700
Resource management and development support	4,970	2,250	4,400
Land Between The Lakes	6,712		6,250
Total natural resources	46,636	26,893	43,450
Economic resources	14,896		11,700
Agricultural resources development	4,931		4,000
National fertilizer development:			
Fertilizer research	16,275	10,430	16,355
Technology introduction	12,085	10,205	10,500
Ammonia-from-coal process	200		
Hardwood fuels research	3,265		2,880
Total national fertilizer development	31,825	20,635	29,735

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1986 estimate	1987 President's request	1987 allowed
General services	1,516	667	615
Total operating expenses	99,804	48,195	89,500
Jobs bill (P.L. No. 98–8)	81		
Total appropriations	120,928	58,038	100,000

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Application of General Reductions

The Committee has recommended bill language to provide direction for the application of General Reductions, Savings and Slippage and possible sequestrations required in FY 1987 by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

For the purposes of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations, programs, projects and activities are defined to include any and all individual items or line items listed, discussed, described, included in or in any way identified or referred to in narrative or tabular documentation or references, including but not limited to the FY 1987 budget submission of the President and supporting justification material as subsequently altered, modified of changed by Congressional action identified in House and Senate Committee reports.

It is the intention that, for purposes of applying unspecified reductions, eachprogram, project and activity, as defined above, shall be reduced proportionately by applying the same reduction percentage as the percentage by which the account is reduced overall. It is not intended that this be used (1) to eliminate programs, projects or activities, (2) to disproportionately reduce personnel, (3) to otherwise reorder funds or priorities, or (4) to initiate unfunded new programs, projects or activities.

Procurement of Electrical Equipment

The importance of our electrical supply, transmission, and distribution system to the national security and economy cannot be overstated. Electrical power is critical to the operation of our increasingly high-technology society.

For nearly two decades, the extra high voltage (EHV) transmission system has been the backbone of our national electricity grid network. The Committee is therefore concerned about the declining numbers of United States manufacturers of EHV components. Of the four United States manufacturers developing, designing, and producing EHV circuit breakers in the early 1970's, none are in business today. Of the five domestic manufacturers of EHV power transformers in the 1970's, only three remain in business. And of the four United States manufacturers of shunt reactors in the 1970's, only two remain in business.

One of the major causes of this decline has been an increase in imports of heavy electrical equipment. Imports of foreign manufactured power transformers, for example, have increased from seven percent of the United States market in the 1970's to nearly 20 percent today. A recent General Accounting Office report found that foreign electrical component manufacturers received significant government benefits, including subsidies and marketing assistance, to help them break into United States markets. That report also found that foreign manufacturers were selling products below cost in order to maintain markets and keep production lines open.

The Committee is concerned that the combination of closed foreign markets and unfair foreign competition will force the remaining domestic manufacturers of EHV electrical equipment out of the market. The vulnerability of the nation's electrical grid system to natural and man-made disasters demands that a capacity to replace damaged equipment remain within the United States. Our dependence on electrical power for all aspects of the nation's commerce and security makes such a capability absolutely essential, especially because the size and weight of much EHV power equipment makes repair and replacement of components from overseas cumbersome and time-consuming. In light of this factor, reliance on foreign suppliers for the nation's entire EHV electrical equipment needs would be both impractical and undesirable.

Over the past decade, more than half of the heavy electrical equipment purchased by the federal power agencies and the Bureau of Reclamation has been of foreign manufacture. Between 1972 and 1984, approximately 92 percent of the high voltage direct current equipment purchased by federal power agencies was manufactured overseas.

In light of the important national security and industrial mobilization interest in maintaining a domestic EHV manufacturing capability, the Committee believes that federal agencies, to the extent practicable, should purchase such equipment from United States manufacturers. Accordingly, the Committee has included language in the bill that would increase the so-called "Buy American" differential to thirty percent for purchases of EHV electrical equipment by federal power authorities. In other words, the federal Power Marketing Administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority would be required to purchase their EHV power equipment from domestic manufacturers if the domestic equipment meets the agency's technical requirements, and if the price of such domestic equipment is not more than thirty percent greater than the price of the most competitive foreign bid.

Because the purpose of this provision is to help "level the playing field" and create an incentive for other countries to open their markets to United States manufacturers, the increased Buy American differential would not apply to purchases of EHV equipment manufactured in countries that offer fair competitive opportunities to United States manufacturers of such equipment.

It is the intent of the Committee that in administering this provision, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall determine whether non-domestic end product EHV power equipment sought to be sold to an agency subject to this provision is manufactured in a country that

offers fair competitive opportunities to United States manufacturers of EHV power equipment. In essence, this involves determining whether or not the country in question imposes unfair trade barriers on United States manufacturers of EHV equipment that are more restrictive than those imposed by the United States on non-United States manufacturers of such equipment. Among the factors to be considered in making this determination, with no single factor being dispositive, are whether the utilities of the country in question are free to, or in fact do, make significant purchases of United States-manufactured EHV power equipment; whether procurement opportunities are publicly advertised or otherwise made available in a manner that enables United States manufacturers of EHV power equipment to meaningfully participate in such procurement competition; and whether procurement contracts for EHV power equipment are awarded on the basis of the most competitive bid.

For the purpose of this provision, "EHV power equipment" shall refer to power transformers, power circuit breakers, shunt reactors, or other alternating current (AC) and direct current (DC) electrical equipment designed to be operated on systems rated above 242 kilovolts.

Hydropower Units at Denison Dam

The Committee has recommended bill language to prohibit the construction of any additional hydropower units at Denison Dam-Lake Texoma in fiscal 1987. It is the Committee's intention that the two currently operating hydropower units at Dension Dam continue to operate, but that no construction be initiated nor any agreements to construct be entered into for additional hydropower units at Denison Dam-Lake Texoma.

The Committee believes it is inappropriate to construct any additional hydropower units at Denison Dam until the ongoing Red River Basin, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas, Comprehensive Study and the Denison Dam Restudy are completed. The Committee strongly supports the earliest possible completion of these studies, and has provided funds to move up the scheduled completion date of the Red River Basin comprehensive study to September 1988.

The Committee does not intend this limitation to interfere with either the current operation of the existing two hydropower units at Denison Dam, nor with the ongoing studies involving Denison Dam, including the Red River Basin comprehensive study and the Denison Dam Restudy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

The following items are included in accordance with various requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

Inflationary Impact Statement

Clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI of the House of Representatives requires that each committee report on a bill or resolution shall contain a statement as to whether enactment of such bill or resolution may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

Titles I and II of the bill contain $4.1 billion for planning, construction and maintenance of water resource development projects. Water is an important input for many industries as well as for private residences. The Committee believes that public works projects will provide for stable supplies of water of lower costs than would be incurred under alternative institutional arrangements. Similarly, many projects will provide for increased supplies of hydroelectric power at costs below every other electric power production alternative.

Public works projects also provide for improved and lower cost water transportation which can reduce the prices of goods by lowering the input costs of industrial production and encouraging large-scale cost industrial production. Lower transportation costs also allow more producers to enter more markets, thereby giving consumers the benefits of increased competition and lower prices.

Titles III and IV of the bill contain approximately $3.7 billion in new budget authority for various energy programs. Every citizen of the United States is well aware of the economic and inflationary impact of the rapid increase in the price of imported oil beginning in 1974. These price increases prompted major increases in the price of all domestic petroleum fuels and significantly increased aggregate inflation. These programs and activities will contribute directly to increasing the supply and availability of more abundant, less costly domestic sources of energy.

The bill contains approximately $7.7 billion for atomic energy defense research and production. These activities help develop defense technologies which meet the national security requirements of the United States and our allies at significantly lower costs.

The Committee concludes that this will result in less inflationary impact.

Comparison With Budget Resolution

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how that authority compares with the re-

ports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to current resolution on the budget for the fiscal year. As of the date when this bill was reported final Congressional action on the First Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1987 has not been completed, and it is therefore impossible to comply with this requirement. The amounts recommended in the accompanying bill are within the amounts assumed in the House passed Budget Resolution pursuant to section 302 of the Budget Act.

The bill provides no new spending authority as described in section 401(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended.

Five-Year Projections

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, the following information was provided to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office:

Budget authority	$15,548,000,000
Outlays:	
1987	9,422,129,000
1988	5,412,035,000
1989	643,265,000
1990	47,600,000
1991 and beyond	22,971,000

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, the following information was provided to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office:

[Balance of information not available at time Bill was reported by Full Committee.]

Financial Assistance to State and Local Governments

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(D) of Public Law 93-344, the new budget authority and outlays provided by the accompanying bill for financial assistance to State and local governments are as follows:

Budget authority	$100,800,000
Fiscal year 1987 outlays resulting therefrom	6,747,000

Transfer of Funds

Pursuant to clause 1(b), rule X, the following is submitted describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill:

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program,

> * * * of which $110,929,000 shall be available for transfers to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), and $145,596,000 shall be available for transfers to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund authorized by section 403 of the Act of September 30, 1968 (43 U.S.C.

1543), and such amounts as may be necessary shall be considered as though advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund for the Boulder Canyon Project as authorized by the Act of December 1, 1928, as amended: *Provided,* That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from that fund: *Provided further,* That transfers to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund may be increased or decreased by transfers within the overall appropriation to this heading: * * *

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Special Funds:

* * * Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified * * *

Under Title III, Department of Energy, Energy Supply, Research and Development,

* * * $684,158,000 shall be derived by transfer from Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities provided in prior years,

Under Title III, Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration,

* * * of which $214,835,000, shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation fund: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer from the Colorado River Dam Fund to the Western Area Power Administration $3,463,000 to carry out the power marketing and transmission activities of the Boulder Canyon project as provided in section 104 (a)(4) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–381, 98 Stat. 1333).

Under Title III, General Provisions, Department of Energy:

SEC. 302. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriations made available for the current fiscal year for Department of Energy activities funded in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise provided, shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such proposed transfers shall be submitted promptly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate for approval.

Under Title III, General Provisions, Department of Energy:

SEC. 303. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities covered in this title may be transferred to a new appropriation account for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established account and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originaly enacted.

Changes in Application of Existing Law

Pursuant to clause 3, rule XXI of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which may directly or indirectly change the application of existing law.

For operation and maintenance for the Corps of Engineers, the following language is included:

> Including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside the harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation.

Also under operation and maintenance language is included providing for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities.

Under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, language is included earmarking funds for the Bolsa Chica/Sunset Harbor, California, and Red River Waterway, Shreveport, Louisiana, to Index, Arkansas, general investigations.

The bill contains language for the Corps of Engineers under Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries directing that not less than $250,000 be available for bank stabilization measures.

Under general provisions in Title I, language is included to prohibit the changing of any project.

Language is included under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, providing of detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction.

Language is included under Construction General providing for construction of water resource projects only after the execution of binding agreements.

Under Corps of Engineers, Construction, General, language is included earmarking funds for the Yatesville Lake project, the Red River Waterway project, the Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet project the Sturgeon Point Marina, New York, project, the New Melones Lake, California, project, the Ouachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas, project, the Clarence Cannon Dam, Missouri, project, and the Levisa/Tug Forks of the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers, West Virginia, Kentucky and Virginia, project.

The bill contains language under Corps of Engineers, Construction, General permitting use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

Under Corps of Engineers, General Expenses, language is included making the funds available until expended. Also under General Expenses, language is included relating to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Engineer Automation Support Activity, and the Water Resources Support Center.

Language is included under Corps of Engineers, Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee directing the repair of the pumping station at DeValls Bluff, Arkansas.

Language is included under Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance, General earmarking funds for construction at Sepulveda Dam, California.

Clarifying language is included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions relating to buildings and facilities at the Corps of Engineers District in Walla Walla, Washington. Also, language is included under General Provisions authorizing construction of the Papillion Creek and tributaries Lakes, Nebraska project and deauthorizing certain features of that project authorized by Public Law 90-483.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, General Investigations providing that funds be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

Language is also included under Bureau of Reclamation, General Investigations permitting advance planning projects to be fully reimbursable.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation Construction Programs which restricts the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis unit.

Language is included under Construction Program providing that funding for the Boulder Canyon Project will be treated as though advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund.

Language is included under Construction Program which permits fund transfers within the overall appropriation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund.

Language is included under Construction Program providing that such sums as necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Fund.

Language is included under Construction Program providing that no funds shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any national monument.

Language is included under Construction Program providing for the continuation of work on the Velarde Community Ditch project, New Mexico.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation General Investigations and Construction Program providing that funds contributed by non-Federal entities shall be available for expenditure.

Language is included under Construction Program providing for the continuation of improvements for the Lower Colorado Regional Complex.

Language is included under Title II regarding the source of appropriated funds in the Construction Program.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation Operation and Maintenance making funds available until expended. The language also provides for a replacement program through readvances to the Colorado River Dam fund.

For the Operation and Maintenance, language is included regarding the source of appropriated funds.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Operation and Maintenance providing that nonreimbursable funds will be available from revenues for performing examination of existing structures of the Colorado River Storage Project.

Language is included under Loan Program limiting gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans.

For the Bureau of Reclamation, Operation and Maintenance, funds collected and used pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 395 from water users are made available until expended.

For the Loan Program language is included regarding the source of appropriated funds.

For the Bureau of Reclamation's Loan Program, language is included to limit the condition on loans. The proviso has been included in appropriations acts since 1959 to permit the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts on loan program projects which cover such time as the Secretary deems necessary but in which the liability of the United States is contingent upon appropriations being made therefor.

Language is included under General Administrative Expenses referring to the six Bureau of Reclamation regions

Language is included under Special Funds identifying the special funds authorized by law from which funds are made available to the Bureau of Reclamation as authorized and making it explicit that such unexpended balances of such funds are to be returned to sources from which derived.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Emergency Fund providing that funds be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

Language is included for appropriation to the Working Capital Fund providing that funds be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

Under the administrative provisions for Bureau of Reclamation, language is included for those items which are authorized subject to language in an authorization bill. The paragraph limits the use of funds to amounts earned under the terms of a contract, otherwise the incurring of obligations is in violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes. Also, language is included providing that no funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance except those derived from advances by water users shall be used for the particular benefits of land.

Language is also included under Bureau of Reclamation, Administrative Provisions providing for the reallocation of project costs for the Seedskadee Project.

Under General Provisions, Department of the Interior; Section 201 provides the Secretary may use funds in Title II for emergency work; Section 202 allows the Secretary to use funds in Title II to fight forest or range fires; Section 203 allows the operation of certain facilities; Section 204 provides that funds will be available for certain purposes necessary to carry out the Department's responsibilities.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program restricting the availability of funds for the North Loup, Nebraska project.

Language is included under the Department of Energy allowing transfers of appropriations to other agencies for certain necessary activities. This language has been carried in previous appropriation acts.

Language is included which prohibits use of funds under this Act to implement or finance authorized price support or loan guarantee programs unless specific provision is made for such programs in an appropriation Act. This language has been carried in previous appropriation Acts.

Language is included under the Department of Energy to permit transfer of unexpended balances of prior appropriations for activities covered in this Act to a new appropriation account for such activities established pursuant to this Act and the balances merged for accounting as one fund.

Language is included under the Geothermal Resources Development Fund and to limit the amounts in the fund available to $500,000,000.

Language is included for Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities and Departmental Administration accounts, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 484, but in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 487, and consistent with the authorization in Public Law 95-238, to permit DOE to utilize revenues to offset appropriations.

Language is included under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to permit the hire of passenger motor vehicles, for official entertainment expenses, and to permit the use of revenues collected to reduce the appropriation as revenues are received.

Language is included under the Bonneville Power Administration for construction of fish passage facilities.

Language is included under Departmental Administration to permit the Department of Energy to cover increases in the cost of work for others provided that increases are offset by increased revenues and to include plant and capital expenses funding along with operating expenses and waives 31 U.S.C. 1511 and 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriation acts.

Language is provided under Atomic Energy Defense Activities that limits the availability of the Strategic Defense Initiative funds to the amount and in the manner provided for in fiscal year 1987 authorizing language.

Language is included to permit the transfer of funds among all Department of Energy appropriations. The appropriation language for these accounts reflects the total estimated program funding to be reduced as revenues are received.

Language is provided under the Appalachian Regional Development program waiving 405 of ARC Act and allocating funds to the Appalachian Foundation, Inc.

Language is included under the Tennessee Valley Authority that makes permanent a provision relating to payments for physician services, and provides the TVA Inspector General with subpoena authority.

Language is included under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission allowing transfer of appropriations to other agencies for certain necessary activities and waives 31 U.S.C. 3302. This lanugage has been carried in previous appropriation acts.

The bill provides for the purchase, hire, operation and maintenance of automobiles and airplanes; purchase, repair and cleaning of uniforms, reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services; publication of certain reports and certain other administrative activites. These provisions have been carried in previous appropriations acts.

Title V—General Provisions contains language, carried in previous appropriations acts, which places limitations on the use of funds in the bill which might under some circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law.

Language is included under General Provisions providing that none of the funds in this Act shall be used to pay intervenors in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

A general provision is included prohibiting the elimination or disproportionate reduction of programs, projects or activities.

A limitation is included that would require agencies included in this Act to procure high voltage electrical equipment from American manufacturers under certain conditions.

A limitation is included prohibiting the construction of additional hydropower units at Denison Dam-Lake Texoma.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1986 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1987

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY—FEDERAL AND TRUST FUNDS

[Becomes available under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompany bill]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1986	New budget (obligational) authority, 1987	Fiscal year 1987 compared with fiscal year 1986
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers - Civil: Permanent appropriations..	9,000,000	9,000,000	---
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations.....	350,000	350,000	---
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project.....	21,740,000	56,376,000	+34,636,000
Department of Energy: Payments to States under Federal Power Act.....	570,000	570,000	---
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow).....	330,000,000	276,100,000	-53,900,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow).	517,876,000	549,180,000	+31,304,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds.....	879,536,000	891,576,000	+12,040,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Rivers and harbors contributed funds.....	96,000,000	227,000,000	+131,000,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds...	16,741,000	28,062,000	+11,321,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work...	125,044,000	86,450,000	-38,594,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust funds.....	3,310,000	1,198,000	-2,112,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Trust funds.....	241,095,000	342,710,000	+101,615,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1987	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
Department of the Army					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	123,478,000	127,000,000	149,411,000	+25,933,000	+22,411,000
Construction, general	879,830,000	1,072,500,000	1,187,734,000	+307,904,000	+115,234,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	23,925,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	+1,075,000	---
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	301,225,000	298,000,000	319,460,000	+18,235,000	+21,460,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,263,248,000	1,420,000,000	1,417,447,000	+154,199,000	-2,553,000
Revolving Fund	6,699,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	+5,301,000	---
General expenses	102,399,000	115,000,000	115,000,000	+12,601,000	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil: New budget (obligational) authority	2,700,804,000	3,069,500,000	3,226,052,000	+525,248,000	+156,552,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Reclamation					
General investigations	32,571,000	27,820,000	32,320,000	-251,000	+4,500,000
Construction program	499,267,000	576,759,000	592,359,000	+93,092,000	+15,600,000
Operation and maintenance	126,960,000	150,000,000	140,000,000	+13,040,000	-10,000,000

Loan program	37,624,000	38,021,000	40,651,000	+3,027,000	+2,630,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(46,237,000)	(43,806,000)	(42,000,000)	(-4,237,000)	(-1,806,000)
General administrative expenses	47,084,000	51,200,000	51,200,000	+4,116,000	---
Emergency fund	957,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+43,000	---
Working Capital fund	---	6,400,000	6,400,000	+6,400,000	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	744,463,000	851,200,000	863,930,000	+119,467,000	+12,730,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:					
New budget (obligational) authority	744,463,000	851,200,000	863,930,000	+119,467,000	+12,730,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(46,237,000)	(43,806,000)	(42,000,000)	(-4,237,000)	(-1,806,000)

TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:					
Operating Expenses	1,479,043,000	1,062,807,000	1,064,696,000	-414,347,000	+1,889,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	217,255,000	191,355,000	251,630,000	+34,375,000	+60,275,000
Subtotal	1,696,298,000	1,254,162,000	1,316,326,000	-379,972,000	+62,164,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:					
Operating Expenses	1,208,500,000	1,271,100,000	1,233,600,000	+25,100,000	-37,500,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	342,612,000	15,300,000	22,800,000	-319,812,000	+7,500,000
Subtotal	1,551,112,000	1,286,400,000	1,256,400,000	-294,712,000	-30,000,000
Gross revenues	-1,360,600,000	-1,286,400,000	-1,286,400,000	+74,200,000	---
Net appropriation	190,512,000	---	-30,000,000	-220,512,000	-30,000,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987—Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1987	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with--	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987
General Science and Research Activities:					
Operating Expenses	510,790,000	604,900,000	577,900,000	+67,110,000	-27,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	145,138,000	168,500,000	160,500,000	+15,362,000	-8,000,000
Subtotal	655,928,000	773,400,000	738,400,000	+82,472,000	-35,000,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	499,037,000	769,349,000	677,649,000	+178,612,000	-91,700,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activites:					
Operating Expenses	5,738,153,000	6,523,694,000	6,233,994,000	+495,841,000	-289,700,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,493,511,000	1,706,306,000	1,459,906,000	-33,605,000	-246,400,000
Subtotal	7,231,664,000	8,230,000,000	7,693,900,000	+462,236,000	-536,100,000
Departmental Administration:					
Operating Expenses	384,606,000	395,116,000	389,697,000	+5,091,000	-5,419,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	9,941,000	7,913,000	7,913,000	-2,028,000	---
Subtotal	394,547,000	403,029,000	397,610,000	+3,063,000	-5,419,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-244,228,000	-251,947,000	-251,947,000	-7,719,000	---
Net appropriation	150,319,000	151,082,000	145,663,000	-4,656,000	-5,419,000

Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,245,000	2,881,000	2,881,000	-364,000	---
Bonneville Power Administration Fund:					
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	---	19,647,000	19,647,000	+19,647,000	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	29,191,000	25,337,000	25,337,000	-3,854,000	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	195,020,000	236,846,000	236,846,000	+41,826,000	---
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(890,000)	(3,463,000)	(3,463,000)	(+2,573,000)	---
Subtotal	227,456,000	284,711,000	284,711,000	+57,255,000	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	91,459,000	99,079,000	99,079,000	+7,620,000	---
Revenues Applied	-49,470,000	-78,754,000	-78,754,000	-29,284,000	---
Subtotal	41,989,000	20,325,000	20,325,000	-21,664,000	---
Geothermal Resources Development Fund					
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	69,000	72,000	72,000	+3,000	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	---	---	(-500,000,000)	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy:					
New budget (obligational) authority	10,693,272,000	11,483,101,000	10,847,046,000	+153,774,000	-636,055,000
Operating Expenses	(8,484,815,000)	(9,393,727,000)	(8,944,297,000)	(+459,482,000)	(-449,430,000)
Plant and Capital Equipment	(2,208,457,000)	(2,089,374,000)	(1,902,749,000)	(-305,708,000)	(-186,625,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	---	---	(-500,000,000)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987—Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 1987	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission:					
Appalachian regional development programs	45,000,000	---	105,000,000	+60,000,000	+105,000,000
Prior year unobligated balance	-10,000,000	---	---	+10,000,000	---
Appalachian Development Highway System	79,745,000	---	---	-79,745,000	---
Subtotal	114,745,000	---	105,000,000	-9,745,000	+105,000,000
Salaries and Expenses	2,200,000	---	---	-2,200,000	---
Total, Appalachian Regional Commission	116,945,000	---	105,000,000	-11,945,000	+105,000,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	161,000	185,000	185,000	+24,000	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	263,000	200,000	289,000	+26,000	+89,000
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	424,000	385,000	474,000	+50,000	+89,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:					
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	79,000	---	79,000	---	+79,000

Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	400,026,000	405,000,000	405,000,000	+4,974,000	---
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	156,000	179,000	179,000	+23,000	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	220,000	240,000	240,000	+20,000	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	376,000	419,000	419,000	+43,000	---
Tennessee Valley Authority:					
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	108,528,000	58,038,000	100,000,000	-8,528,000	+41,962,000
Prior year unobligated balance	-9,000,000	---	---	+9,000,000	---
Subtotal	99,528,000	58,038,000	100,000,000	+472,000	+41,962,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies:					
New budget (obligational) authority	617,378,000	463,842,000	610,972,000	-6,406,000	+147,130,000
Grand total, all titles:					
New budget (obligational) authority	14,755,917,000	15,867,643,000	15,548,000,000	+792,083,000	-319,643,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(66,237,000)	(63,806,000)	(52,000,000)	(-14,237,000)	(-11,806,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	---	---	(-500,000,000)	---

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF CONGRESSMEN LES AuCOIN AND NORMAN D. DICKS

Since the Committee rejected two amendments we offered concerning site characterization of the proposed Hanford civilian nuclear waste repository, we have strong reservations about the funds contained in this bill for the Department of Energy's Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund.

The Administration's recent decision to select three sites—Hanford, Washington, Deaf Smith County, Texas, and Yucca Mountain, Nevada—and to call off the site selection process for a second repository and a Monitored Retrievable Storage facility is not only an exercise in bad judgment, it is a violation of Section 112 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act which requires selection of 3 sites for a second repository by July 1, 1989.

Further, by making Hanford one of the three finalists for the first repository site, the Department of Energy and the Administration have consciously chosen to take the issue out of the realm of merit and to put it into the realm of politics.

Simply put, Hanford rated dead last in the Department's evaluation of the five candidate sites. Its bottom-of-the-barrel ranking included last place finishes on issues of cost, safety, and geologic stability. Overall evaluations of both short- and long-term impacts put Hanford last on the list both times.

Despite that showing, Hanford has been identified as one of three finalists for locating the civilian waste repository. One billion dollars will be spent on site characterization. The problems at Hanford are myriad, and the accumulation of over 40 years' worth of waste from defense-related activities there is already an extraodinarily troubling situation. Hanford should be withdrawn from consideration as a possible repository site immediately. While the Committee chose not to accept the amendments, this effort will continue.

Those amendments, first to bar funding for site characterization and, second, to require a full environmental impact statement before characterization is begun, are sensible alternatives to addressing the very real problems at the Hanford site. The people of the Pacific Northwest want to be assured that the greatest care is put into site selection for the repository, and that any site is not selected as a consequence of politics rather than merit.

Clearly, Hanford's presence on the list of three finalists has already put those assurances into doubt. The House of Representatives should take out the politics and put the site selection process back on the basis of merit.

LES AUCOIN.
NORM DICKS.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN BILL ALEXANDER

Outdoor recreation and tourism is a major segment of the economy of Arkansas. This is particularly true in north central Arkansas where the Corps of Engineers operates a number of lake and river projects.

Local governments and the private business community in these areas have been strongly supportive of Corps operations. They have encouraged and developed many private businesses serving the needs of visitors to these reservoirs.

In recent months, intense and increasing concern has arisen over reports that the Corps intends to lease, "privatize", its publicly-owned recreational resources to private entrepreneurs. There appears to be a clear danger that the Corps may operate its leasing program in a way that could cause environmental damage, harm existing private businesses adjacent to the reservoirs and reduce the opportunities for public use of the recreational resources at the lake and river projects.

As a part of my effort to assist our people in Arkansas in obtaining information on the Corps leasing program, I sought copies of Corps policy, guidelines, rules and/or regulations. No such documents were forthcoming.

Therefore, on April 30, 1986, I wrote Lt. Gen. E. R. Heiberg III, Chief of the Corps of Engineers, about this matter. I requested information, setting out a series of interrogatories, on interpretation of law, on economic and environmental policy, on the right of the public to have input in the leasing program decisions, and on ways and means the Corps would employ to protect the public's continued right to use lake and river recreational resources under Corps jurisdiction and to protect the interests of existing private businesses located adjacent to Corps reservoirs. While I have been assured that a response to my request for information will be provided, none has been received.

I believe that the questions which I have raised with the Chief of Engineers in connection with this issue of leasing publicly-owned recreational resources are of vital importance to the people of north central Arkansas and other concerned Americans. It is my intention to continue to pursue this matter. Because of the national importance of the questions which have arisen, I am making my letter to the Chief of Engineers a part of this report by including as a part of these additional views.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1986.

LTG E.R. HEIBERG III,
Chief of Engineers,
Department of the Army,
Washington, DC

Dear General Heiberg,

Arkansans, particularly those in First Congressional District, believe in private enterprise, are concerned about the environment and about the quality of life. So when they warn the Corps that actions the Corps says will help private enterprise and the taxpayers will actually hurt both, it is time to pay attention. It is time to stop, look and listen to what our people are saying.

Recent reports of Corps efforts to carry-out a leasing, or "privatization", program at lakes, reservoirs and river projects under Corps jurisdiction, particularly at Greers Ferry Lake and on the Little Red River, have sparked intense opposition among community leaders, including operators of private businesses.

For instance, in an April 12 meeting, members of the Greers Ferry Lake and Little Red River Association unanimously adopted a resolution in opposition to such a leasing, "privatization", program. The resolution, which is attached to this letter, states in part:

> * * * The Greers Ferry Lake and Little Red River Association, which is a State chartered, non-profit regional tourist promotion organization, voted unanimously to oppose the proposed leasing to private enterprise of Parks and Campgrounds presently operated on Greers Ferry Lake and The Little Red River and nationally by the Corps of Engineers.
>
> * * * our intent (is) to actively oppose said proposed leasing by the Federal Government of Parks built with tax-payers funds, as said leasing will cause increased charges to the public, eliminate free day use, cause pollution of the Lakes and Rivers and drastically affect the quality of life. (Attachment I.)

I join these concerned Arkansans in opposing leasing, or "privatization", actions by the Corps which could reduce currently available opportunities for the public to use publicly-owned parks and campgrounds and other facilities, increase pollution, and adversely affect the quality of life in the region. And, I request that the Corps ensure that the concerned citizens of the Greers Ferry Lake and Little Red River region be given an opportunity, at a public hearing to be conducted in a location central to this specific region, to be fully briefed and to fully express their views on this matter.

Additionally, I urge the Corps of Engineers to ensure that the legitimate and lawful interests of existing private business operators in the region of Greers Ferry Lake and the Little Red River are fully and completely protected from damage which could result from Corps leasing activities.

Since beginning my investigation of this matter, I have become increasingly concerned about how the Corps is going about its pro-

permit to lease these lands and facilities. I found more questions than answers. Thus, I urge that the Corps cease and desist from actions to lease public lands and facilities under its jurisdiction at least until all these questions, and any other questions which may arise during the course of re-examining this leasing, or "privatization", issue are fully, completely and satisfactorily answered.

Attached to this letter, and herewith incorporated as a part of this letter, is a set of questions, in the form of interrogatories, on the leasing, or "privatization" issue for which I request responses from the Corps. (Attachment II).

Thank you for your consideration of the views of concerned Arkansans and my requests for cooperation from the Corps on this matter.

Sincerely,

BILL ALEXANDER,
Member of Congress.

ATTACHMENT I

GREERS FERRY LAKE AND LITTLE RED RIVER ASSOCIATION

Clinton Fairfield Bay Heber Springs Greers Ferry

RESOLUTION

The Greers Ferry Lake and Little Red River Association, at a special called meeting on Saturday, April 12, 1986 adopted the following Resolution.

Be it resolved that The Greers Ferry Lake and Little Red River Association which is a State Chartered non-profit regional tourist promotion organization, voted unanimously to oppose the proposed leasing to private enterprises of Parks and Campgrounds presently operated on Greers Ferry Lake and The Little Red River and nationally by the Corps of Engineers.

It is further resolved to inform the public and the news media of our intention to actively oppose said proposed leasing by the Federal Government of Parks built with tax payers funds, as said leasing will cause increased charges to the public, eliminate free day use, cause pollution of the Lakes and Rivers and eventually affect the quality of life.

Signed this 12th day of April, 1986.

Greers Ferry Lake and Little Red River Association.

President: Lee Evans.

Executive Director: Bette Vogel.

[April 30, 1986]

ATTACHMENT II

Memorandum to: LTG E.R. Heiberg III, Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Department of the Army.
From: Bill Alexander, Member of Congress, First Congressional District, Arkansas.
In re: Corps Proposals to Lease, "Privatize", Public Property at Lakes, Reservoirs, and on Reaches of Rivers under Its Jurisdiction.

Intense opposition has been expressed by Arkansans to recent reports of proposals for leasing public lands, facilities and, possibly, waters under the Corps jurisdiction. I have initiated an investigation of applicable laws, regulations and procedures under which the Corps proposes to operate such a program as cited above. Many questions have arisen, but few clear answers appear to be available.

Therefore, I, hereby, am requesting answers to the questions set out in the following sections of this memorandum.

SEC. 210, P.L. 90-483

Sec. 210 of Public Law 90-483 sets clear limits on the facilities for which the Corps may and may not charge user fees. A principal of law is that the owner of property may not lease that property to another entity under a lease which permits the lessee to conduct activities which the property owner is prohibited by law from conducting. Specifically, with regard to lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps, Sec. 210 states that:

> User fees at these lakes and reservoirs shall be collected by officers and employees of the United States only from users of highly developed facilities requiring continuous presence of personnel for maintenance and supervision, and shall not be collected for access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided.

At Greers Ferry Lake, for instance, there are 15 parks. Access to many campsites, water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, and boat launching ramps which do not have mechanical or hydraulic equipment is within the boundaries of these parks. Entry is achieved via one access road per park. These parks are not "highly developed facilities". They do not have "continuous presence of personnel for maintenance and supervision". In fact, at 13 of these parks, the only personnel assigned are summer seasonal personnel staffing an entry gate and having as their only duties the collection of user fees from persons intending to use a camping site located inside the park. All non-campsite users have free access to these publicly owned areas.

1. A. If the Corps decided it would lease parks such as those located at Greers Ferry Lake or similar facilities it controls on the Little Red River, would it be the Corps' interpretation that the lan-

guage of Sec. 210 requires that the lease prohibit the leasee from making any user fee charge for any existing facilities other than these facilities for which the Corps currently charges a user fee?

B. If not, why not?

2. A. If the Corps decided to lease parks such as those located at Greers Ferry Lake and the Little Red River, would the Corps' interpretation of Sec. 210 be that the leasee would have to permit the public free access to all currently existing facilities or elements within the park other than those for which the Corps currently charges user fees?

B. If not, why not?

3. A. If the Corps issued a lease for parks such as those located at Greers Ferry Lake and on the Little Red River, would the Corps require that the leasee continue to make available to the public, facilities such as those which are currently available, at similar fees if user fees are currently charged by the Corps, or free if no user fees are currently charged, even if the leasee used other property in the park for creating "highly developed facilities"?

B. If not, why not?

4. A. Has the Corps issued a legal interpretation of Sec. 210 as that section relates to the Corps' leasing, or "privatization", program as it applies to existing parks, campgrounds, and other lands, waters, or facilities at lakes, reservoirs, or river projects under Corps jurisdiction?

B. If not, why not?

C. If so, is this interpretation document available to the public?

D. If it is not available to the public, why not?

PUBLIC NOTICE, BRIEFINGS, HEARINGS, COMMENT

Even the possiblity of the Corps carrying out a leasing, or "privatization", program in connection with parks, campgrounds and other facilities at Greers Ferry Lake and on Little Red River has stimulated sufficient concern among regional leaders, including private business operators, to make "privatization" at these locations very controversial.

1. A. Does the Corps have in place regulations and/or guidelines which mandate the Corps to give local residents, community leaders, private business operators and state and local governments notice of its intent or interest in carrying out a "privatization" program at its lakes, reservoirs and river projects?

B. If not, why not?

2. A. If the Corps does not have in place regulations and/or guidelines which require the Corps to give to local residents, community leaders, private business operators, and state and local governments notice and its intent to or interest in "privatizing" lake, reservoir and river lands and facilities under its jurisdiction, and to give interested parties opportunity, at a location central to the specifically affected region, to comment, does it plan to issue such regulations and/or guidelines before further pursing "privatization" at lakes, reservoirs and river projects its jurisdiction in Arkansas?

B. If so, when?

C. If not, why not?

REGULATIONS, GUIDELINES FOR CORPS' "PRIVATIZATION" PROGRAM

1. A. Has the Corps issued any regulations and/or guidelines specifically and distinctly governing leasing, or "privatization", of parks, campgrounds and other similar facilities existing or which might be built with public funds at Corps lakes and reservoirs and on rivers under Corps jurisdiction?

B. If not, why not?

C. If so, please provide me a copy of these regulations and/or guidelines and a chronology of their development and issuance, including the public meetings and public comment periods observed.

2. If the Corps has not issued such regulations and/or guidelines, but has plans to do so, what is the schedule for doing this?

3. It is my understanding that at the Corps' Percy Priest Lake at Nashville, Tennessee, the Corps has permitted the establishment, on public lands, of a park/club development which restricts use to ony those persons who are able to obtain memberships in the park/club development.

B. If it is correct, under what federal statute does the Corps have authority to permit such a private activity, thereby limiting access to public lands and waters to the privileged few who may obtain such a park/club membership?

C. Within its "privatization" program, does the Corps anticipate such developments at other lakes, reservoirs or river projects under its jurisdiction?

Master plan

It is my understanding that at the time a Corps lake, reservoir, or multi-purpose river project was constructed, or came into the jurisdiction of the Corps, or at a later date, the Corps developed a Master Plan setting out the uses to which the land and waters would be put and the level of development to be achieved. It is further my understanding that under Corps rules and regulations, public hearings had to be held in connection with the Master Plan and must be held in connection with any amendment or modification of such Master Plan.

1. A. In connection with its "privatization" program, does the Corps anticipate that amendments or modifications will have to be made to the Master Plans for any, some, or most of its lakes, reservoirs or multi-purpose river projects?

B. Specifically, Greers Ferry Lake and/or the Little Red River?

2. A. If the Corps pursues "privatization" of its existing facilities at Greers Ferry Lake, or on Little Red River, does the current Master Plan(s) permit any higher degree of "development" of facilities than currently exist at these locations?

B. If not, and the Corps receives a proposal from a potential leasee which proposal calls for the leasee to be granted the right to construct "highly developed facilities", at what point would the Corps begin work to modify the Master Plan for Greers Ferry Lake and/or Little Red River, and how early in that modification or amendment process would the public be given notice of the intent to change the Master Plan and be given an opportunity to participate in public hearings and in public comment on such proposed changes?

3. What would be the maximum development a "privatization" program leasee could do at Greers Ferry Lake or on Little Red River under the existing Master Plan(s) without any modification of the existing Master Plan(s)?

Economic impact assessment

In response to private enterprise opportunities and to meet needs of the millions of persons visiting lakes, reservoirs and river facilities under Corps jurisdiction in north central Arkansas, a private enterprise infrastructure has developed. It is primarily located on private lands. Because the resources available for economic development in this region, other than recreation and tourism-based economic development, are limited, recreation and tourism private enterprises are the lynch-pins of the region's economy. Such private enterprises are highly sensitive to changes in the costs of recreation and tourism activities, including user costs associated with public facilities.

Based on some discussions of proposals to lease, or "privatize", existing facilities and lands at lake, reservoir, and river projects under the Corps' jurisdiction, it appears that such a program holds substantial potential for significant increases in costs to potential visitors to such facilities, visitors whose spending is the life-blood of the private businesses serving the region.

In view of the relationship between the number and kinds of visitors using the lakes, reservoirs and rivers under Corps jurisdiction and the adjacent private businesses, it appears that reason and fairness would require the Corps to make full and thorough studies of the potential economic impact of "privatization" on existing private businesses before pursuing a "privatization" program at a specific location.

1. Does the Corps require that an economic impact study be made of "privatization" impact on existing private businesses prior to proceeding with the leasing of property at its lake, reservoir and river projects?

2. If the Corps does not make such studies, why not, since the Corps essentially could be setting up new, privileged businesses to compete with existing private businesses?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, STATEMENT

Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, federal departments, agencies and other entities, taking or permitting actions affecting the environment are required to make an environmental assessment and, if such actions have a significant impact on the environment, are required to issue an environmental impact statement.

1. A. In the instance of private enterprise proposals to lease lands, waters and/or facilities at lakes, reservoirs and/or river projects, made in connection with the Corps "privatization" program, is it the rule that an environmental assessment must be made on all such lease proposals?

B. If so, who makes the assessment and what is the highest level within the Corps at which the assessment is approved?

C. If not, why not?

D. If so, is it, or will it be, the Corps practice to give notice to interested persons and organizations in the area most directly affected and afford those persons and organizations an opportunity to make public comment?

E. If not, why not?

2. A. If a potential leasee proposes a lease for an activity the Corps determines falls within the terms of the Master Plan for the lake, reservoir, or river project, does the Corps take the position that the environmental assessment or environmental statement associated with the Master Plan when it was adopted and/or amended, and/or otherwise modified, is sufficient and no further assessment or EIS is required?

B. If so, why?

C. If the response to "A" above is affirmative, does that affirmative response apply regardless of the level of development which has occurred on lands and/or waters adjacent to, but not a part of, the affected project since the last environmental assessment or EIS was made in connection with the Master Plan?

D. If so, why?

3. Who makes the final determination on whether a potential leasee's proposal falls within the terms and provisions of the Master Plan?

4. In the case of Greers Ferry Lake, and at least in some areas of the Little Red River, the geology is such that granite or stone of similar high density is either surface exposed or found at a shallow depth in most of the Corps controlled lands and much adjacent acreage.

A. In these circumstances, what would be the maximum development, in terms of types and kinds, that a leasee would be permitted to carry out on Greers Ferry lands or waters, or Little Red River lands or waters before the Corps would determine that such development requires an environmental assessment?

B. Given the geological factors cited in "A" above, what would be the maximum development, in terms of types and kinds, that a leasee would be permitted to carry out on Greers Ferry lands or waters, or Little Red River lands or waters, before the Corps would determine that such development requires an environmental impact statement?

Payments of lease holders

Discussions of possible methods of "privatization" of lands and facilities at Corps lake, reservoir and river projects have indicated that such leasing programs could (a) lease existing facilities to private operators with restrictions against additional development; and/or (b) lease lands and/or waters to private operators for the purpose of increasing the level of development at such locations.

1. A. If the Corps leases currently existing facilities to a private operator will the Corps require the leasee to pay a fair market value rental or lease payment and to do so from the beginning date of the lease?

B. If so, how will the fair market value be established?

C. If not, why would the Corps give the private operator such an advantage over existing private businesses not located on publicly-

owned lands and in advantageous proximity to publicly-owned waters?

2. A. If the Corps leases currently existing facilities to a private operator, under terms prohibiting further development, will the Corps require the leasee to pay a fair market value rental or lease payment and to do so from the beginning date of the lease?

B. If so, how will the fair market value be established?

C. If not, why would the Corps give the private operator such an advantage over existing private businesses not located on publicly-owned lands and in advantageous proximity to publicly-owned waters?

3. A. If the Corps leases currently existing facilities, lands and/or waters with rights to increase the level of development, to a private operator, will the Corps require the leasee to pay, from the beginning date of the lease, a fair market value price for the public lands, waters and/or pre-existing public facilities covered by the leases and to do so from the beginning date of the lease?

B. If not, why not?

4. A. Does the Corps intend that any, some or all of leases granted under its "privatization" program associated with recreational facilities at its lake, reservoir and river projects will require the leasee to maintain, to at least the standard existing at the beginning of the lease, those publicly-owned facilities existing at the time the lease is initiated?

B. If not, why not?

BILL ALEXANDER.

○

61-313 (176)